

4139
Allyffe (J) R^A
DEFENCE
OF

Ministerial
CONFORMITY
TO THE
Church of *England*:

In ANSWER to the
Misrepresentations
Of the Terms thereof

By Mr. CALAMY,

In the tenth Chapter of his Abridgment of the
History of Mr. *Baxter's* Life and Times.

L O N D O N,

Printed by T. W. for *Richard Wilkin* at the
Kings-Head in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1702.

DEFENCE

OF

Ministerial

CONFORMITY

TO THE

Church of England;



In Answer to

Misrepresentations

Of the Terms thereof

By Mr. CALAMY

In the tenth Chapter of his Abridgement of the
History of Mr. Baxter's Life and Times.

LONDON

Printed by T. W. for Richard E. Smith at the
Kings-Head in St. Pauls Church-Yard, 1702.

TO THE
Right Honourable
WILLIAM
Lord Marquis of *Hartington.*

My Lord,

Since Mr. *Calamy* hath been pleas'd to prefix your *Lordship's* Honourable Name to his *Abridgment of the History of Mr. Baxter's Life*, possibly your *Lordship* may have had the Curiosity amongst other things to take a view of his tenth Chapter, wherein He hath collected the grounds of the Nonconformity of the *Ejected Ministers*; He hath pretended to give us the whole *Strength of the Arguments* on their side, and to present to us the *whole Cause in Debate*; and saith, that *He questions not but your*

A 2

Lord-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Lordship will find things fairly and impartially represented.

And it may be your *Lordship* may have the like Curiosity to see what Reply may be made to these Pretensions, and to what He hath there alledg'd ; upon the Review whereof your *Lordship* will not wonder that some Ministers of the *Church of England* found themselves aggriev'd thereby, or that they met together to make their Complaints, and to enquire of each other their Thoughts of the Terms of Conformity, which they perceiv'd to be so much mistaken. Those Thoughts being drawn up into the following Defence, I was perswaded to present it to your *Lordship*; It is not in the least intended as a Reflection, either upon those excellent Persons, whose assistance Mr. *Calamy* hath made use of in compiling this Chapter, particularly that Great and Holy

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Holy Man, whose Book He hath here undertaken to give us the summary of; or, upon those others who went upon any of the same grounds which they had done, many of whose Characters Mr. *Calamy* hath given us in another Chapter, and whose Memory we do sincerely profess to have a very high Honour for: But it is meerly in our own Defence, who have, we hope, from a clear Conviction of Conscience, been satish'd to conform to the Establisht Church; and to free our selves from those Reflections, which Mr. *Calamy* doth very often insinuate, and which (to say the truth) would be very hard upon us, in the Sense of all Men, if we were not able to give a just and fair account of our Practice, which we doubt not to be able to do, Mr. *Calamy's* whole discourse on this matter, from one end to the other, seem-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

ing to us to be one continued Missepresentation of the Terms of Conformity, which we have comply'd with: So that those worthy Persons bind heavy Burdens on themselves by severe and rigid Interpretations, which the Law doth not require; and when the plain Construction and Use of Words would not only admit, but do fairly call for another Sense, without any Stretch or Force.

We desire that it may not be interpreted to arise from a stiff adherence to the things in debate, that we make this Defence neither; and that it may not be understood to be intended by us, either to procure and confirm an unalterable stiffness in others, whom it may concern, to retain the same; or to obstruct an Accommodation of Differences amongst us, by such Concessions as are necessary for a *Comprehension* of sober Dissenters, which we
do

The Epistle Dedicatory.

do still most passionately long, and most earnestly wish for. We may justify our selves and vindicate our own Practice in our Assent to, and use of those things, which we are fully satisfi'd of the Lawfulness of; yet in compassion to our Brethren, who have different Sentiments from what we have; and for the putting an end to those unhappy Contests and Animosities, which have so long obtain'd among us, to the great dishonour of our Christian Profession, the diminution of the Power of Godliness, and the great Encouragement of Atheism, Deism and Infidelity; and for the promoting of Christian Peace and Concord, which would most highly tend to the Advancement of Religion in general, and to the Stability, Settlement and Honour of our Church in particular: For these Reasons we cannot but most

The Epistle Dedicatory.

affectionately desire that there might be the *Comprehension* aforesaid, join'd with the *limited Toleration*; which, we believe, would be one great means, by the Blessing of Almighty God, to make us the Glory of Christianity, an happy People within our selves, and a terror to our Enemies about us. And therefore far be it from us ever to attempt or do any thing whatsoever, which might but seem to have the least tendency to the propagating or increas'ing of our Unchristian Breaches. It is to be acknowledged, that Mr. *Calamy* hath spoken very worthily, and with much Respect and Honour of several Conformists, for which we own our Obligations to Him, and I hope we shall not forfeit this his good Opinion by any thing that will be said by us. Nothing could ever extort so much as this Defence from us, but a persuasion

The Epistle Dedicatory.

swasion that it is a just Debt, which we owe to Religion it self, and to our own Christian Reputation, that at least it may appear, that we are Honest Men, to them that dissent from us, and that we do not make our Livings and Preferments, the Rule of our Minds and Consciences.

A Comprehension was attempted in the beginning of the Last Happy Reign: We heartily wish that it may be again reassum'd under the Auspicious Government of Her present Majesty, and that it might be once taken into Effectual Consideration by that August Assembly, which is shortly to meet, and of which, we hope, your Lordship will be a very illustrious Member, and an happy Instrument to promote the same.

It may be perhaps objected, that it is uncertain what the Dissenters would

The Epistle Dedicatory.

would have, or what may be necessary to be done, for the promoting the end propos'd: But for this it need but be considered, what Mr. *Catamy* p. 655. hath said, that the concessions made by the 30 Bishops and Divines that met in the Jerusalem Chamber, A. 1689. with such an allowance in the point of Orders, as is made 13 Eliz. ch. 12. would in all probability have brought in two Thirds of all the Dissenters in England. Of these thirty one half are at present Living, and Bishops in this Church, so that the Terms are very well known.

I shall here give your Lordship no farther trouble: But praying that your Lordship may long continue, as you have began to be, an Ornament and Pattern of all Wisdom and Virtue in that Church, to which you belong, in humble Confidence of your
Lordship's

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Lordship's favourable Interpretation
of this bold and presumptuous Ad-
dress from an unknown Person, I on-
ly add, that I am

Your Lordship's

Most Humble and most

Obedient Servant

John Ollyffe.

THE

The Epistle Dedicatory

Lordship's favourable interpretation
of this bold and presumptuous Ad-
dress from an unknown Person, I on-
ly add, that I am

Your Lordship's

Most Humble and most

Obedient Servant

John Olfitt

THE

THE CONTENTS.

| | |
|--|-------|
| S ome things premis'd in favour of the <i>Ejected Ministers, and shewing the design of this Defence.</i> | p. 2 |
| <i>The main Question propos'd, and the Rule, on which the Determination of it is to proceed.</i> | p. 12 |
| <i>Of the Declaration of Assent and Con- sent.</i> | p. 18 |
| <i>Of Baptismal Regeneration.</i> | p. 26 |
| <i>Of the Use of Godfathers and Godmo- thers.</i> | p. 32 |
| <i>Of denying Baptism to them that want them.</i> | p. 40 |
| <i>Of the Sign of the Cross used in or after Baptism.</i> | p. 43 |
| <i>Of kneeling at the Lord's Supper.</i> | p. 54 |
| <i>Of the Approbation of the three Orders, Bishops, Priests and Deacons.</i> | p. 58 |
| Of | |

The Contents.

| | |
|---|--------|
| Of some passages in the Office of Burial. | p. 63 |
| Of the Rule to find out Easter. | p. 70 |
| Of the Use of Apocryphal Lessons. | p. 71 |
| Of the Use of the Old Translation of the Psalter. | p. 74 |
| Of Assent and Consent to the Athanasian Creed. | p. 79 |
| Of denying the Holy Communion to them, who are not confirm'd. | p. 82 |
| Of the Oath of Canonical Obedience. | p. 84 |
| Of the Excommunicating Canons. | p. 96 |
| Of Administring the Communion to them that do not kneel. | p. 99 |
| Of Refusing Communicants from other Parishes. | p. 100 |
| Of the Surplice. | p. 101 |
| Of baptizing all Children without exception that are offered. | p. 102 |
| Of keeping private Fasts. | p. 103 |
| Of giving in the Names of the Non-Communicants to the Bishop. | p. 105 |
| Of | |

The Contents.

Of the Power of the Keys and Ecclesiastical Discipline. p. 107

Addenda. p. 44

Postscript concerning Reordination. p. 124

ERRATA

~~Page 2, lines 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.~~

A De-

The Contents.

Of the Power of the Keys and Ecclesiastical Discipline. p. 107
Addenda. p. 44
Manuscript concerning Reordination. p. 124

ERRATA.

Page 5. line 22. for *those* read *this*. p. 28. l. 3. r. *Confirmation*. l. 28. r. *laver*. p. 31. l. 14. r. *Article*. p. 64. l. 18. after *Passage* add *in*. p. 79. l. 14. for *Ascend* r. *Assent*.

5 JY 61

A Defence of Ministerial Conformity to the Church of England, in Answer to the Misrepresentations of the Terms thereof, by Mr. Calamy in the tenth Chapter of his Abridgment of Mr. Baxter's Life.

IT is very manifest, that there have been almost from the Beginning of the Reformation two sorts of Persons in the Church: One pleading high for the imposition of the Ceremonies, and maintaining the Expediency of rigorous urging Subscriptions and Declarations to the imposed terms of Conformity, under very severe penalties, though they allowed many of the things impos'd to be in their own nature indifferent; The other sort disliking the imposition of several things, especially under such penalties, and, when ever they have been call'd to it, manifesting that dislike, yet being perswaded of the lawfulness of the things impos'd, have thought it their Duty to conform thereunto, and at proper Seasons to defend their so doing.

2 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

The former sort being most opposite to the Nonconformists in their Judgments, and generally Strangers to them in their converse, have very warmly managed their disputes against them; which have been return'd with as much eagerness on the part of the Nonconformists, that by continual Exasperations of each other, their Books have been fill'd too much on both sides with Mistakes and Misrepresentations of their Adversaries: Not many of the latter sort have been willing to concern themselves in the Controversy, but have contented themselves with being satisfi'd in their own minds, and keeping a fair correspondence with as many as call'd for their company on both sides, have been ready to do any good Offices for Reconciliation and Peace. And when they are forc'd to defend themselves and their own practice (as they conceive they are now by Mr. Calamy's Misrepresentations of what they together with others have comply'd with) they desire that these two things may be premis'd,

1. That as they had no hand in the rigorous Impositions complain'd of by the Nonconformists, so they have no Heart nor Will to the continuance of them: some of them have done all they can to remove them, when the Governours have made any Overtures towards such a thing; we need

no other proof, than what Mr. Calamy confesseth in this very Book p. 655, &c. concerning the *Ecclesiastical Commission* in 1689 and those who vindicated it. They have Wrote, Preach'd, Discours'd, and Pray'd for abatements in Conformity; and when any hopeful means thereof have fail'd, none have more lamented and mourn'd than they.

2. That they have had and continue a great Respect and Reverence to the Persons of the *Ejected Ministers*: and bating some few Mistakes which Mr. Calamy would be ready upon information to rectify, they highly approve of the Characters which Mr. Calamy hath given of them and thank him for them; many of which they can subscribe to upon their own Knowledge; nay, many of them are taken from the Mouths and Pens of the Conformists. They are ready to own what their Brother said of one of them quoted by Mr. Calamy p. 331 and could repeat it of many more, that it had been alone worth an *Act of Comprehension* to have included the smallest number of so valuable men. Indeed as to the present Ministers since risen up amongst the Nonconformists, they cannot esteem their case the same with that of the *Ejected Ministers*, nor their Age (to say no more) to require the same Reverence; yet would they cultivate a fair cor-

4 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

respondence with them : But as to the ~~Former~~, they have revered their Persons for their Age , Learning , and Ministerial Abilities ; divers of them owe much to their good Instructions , have had recourse to them in their Doubts ; have bewailed the loss that the Church had by their silencing , and the places where they liv'd by their death , when now they are almost all gone off the Stage. Thus far then , there is no matter of Difference or Controversy between Mr. Calamy and them , who make the following *Defence against his Misrepresentations of the Terms of Conformity*.

And to make it appear that it is a bare defence of themselves and their own Practice that is hereby intended , They do , 1. lay aside all consideration of the Terms of Conformity that are now expir'd , or wherein themselves now are not concern'd particularly as to the *Renouncing of the Covenant and Reordination*. It being sufficient for them to manifest to the World , that what they have done , and others are now call'd to do in Conformity , is fairly vindicable from the strange gloss that Mr. Calamy puts upon it. 2. They wave the Consideration how far any of the *Ejected Ministers* did agree with Mr. Calamy in their Apprehensions of the Terms of Conformity , or how far they did well or ill in
their

their Refusal of them. They conceive that this *Defence* and necessary Vindication of themselves is not to be deemed any Reflection upon the *Ejected Ministers*, any more than they must Reflect upon one another, because as Mr. *Calamy* observes p. 497 *they had their diversity of Sentiments among themselves about these matters, some of them could have gone much farther than others in Compliance with Authority.* They can easily conceive of many things that keep up the Honour of the *Ejected Ministers*, notwithstanding the Refusal of the Terms of Conformity, which others judge fit to be comply'd with, without charging them with Humour, Faction, &c. yea they heartily pity them under the hardships that were put upon them, considering,

1. That they were surpriz'd with the Hast and Speed with which the Terms of Conformity were urg'd. This Mr. *Calamy* takes notice of p. 502. He makes those indeed a Reflection upon them who conform'd at first, wherein we are not concern'd: They who are reflected upon are at age (yea, come to an old age.) *let them answer for themselves.* There is but one Person concern'd therein in these parts yet living, and he being ask'd concerning the Charge, viz. that *they made the Declaration*

6 A Defence of Ministerial Conformity

before they saw the Book, denies the matter of Fact as to himself and others that liv'd near him, (which was then about the middle of the Land) and saith, *that they sent to London and had the Amendments and Alterations copy'd out, and then considered them amongst themselves.* But though it is to be hop'd that the charge is groundless against so many thousand Ministers, yet it cannot be deny'd that the Haste and Speed, which the Act requir'd, was a very great Hardship: for though they had or might have procured the Copies of the Alterations, if not the Books, yet had they not sufficient time to weigh the matters in Controversy; Books were not yet written to explain the matters doubted of. Hence it came to pass that so great a number did comply with the Terms who at first refus'd them, as we learn from Mr. Calamy, who gives us the names of 167 of them.

2. That they were fill'd with many Prejudices and Prepossessions which they could not get over: These must be allowed to be in the best of Men, and mightily to sway the Judgment where they are; To these they must attribute *the difference of Sentiments about these and other things amongst themselves*; and whether they are taken from Education, Complexion, Interest, Custom or whatever

ever else, they are such as the most Wise and Holy Men cannot free themselves from. As to the case before us; In many of them, matters of State-affairs were intermingled with things of another Nature, and might something discompose their Thoughts: and if this did not extend far, yet certain it is, that in and after a long War, and during those unsettled times, the things now impos'd upon them, had been vehemently oppos'd and run down; they were almost all pre-engag'd against them; some by solemn Covenant thought themselves bound to oppose them: *The elder of them* had been personally engag'd in the removing of them, had Written and Preach'd against them, and thought it *a Transgression to build again what they had pluck'd down*, applying the Apostles word to this purpose. *The Younger* sort had been bred up from the first entrance into the work of the Ministry in the dislike of the things impos'd, and could not of a sudden get over all those Impressions that time had made upon them. Besides all this, They were not a little *prejudic'd* against the Persons who then sat at the Helm, and who were the Instruments in those Impositions. The Bishops and other Royalists had their particular Resentments against them; They had before been turn'd out of their Livings and

8 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity.*

Dignities; all of them were not equally ready to forgive; but now getting the upper ground, they with too much bitterness refus'd the Accommodation that was offer'd: some are said even to be desirous to get rid of those Men who had been favoured before by the Enemies of the Royal party. Now when the Ministers that afterwards were ejected thus look'd upon the Bishops and Imposers as their Enemies, what wonder if even good Men mistrusted all they said and did; and thought those things to be evil which Men whom they apprehended to be their Adversaries on purpose contriv'd as against them? These *Prejudices* were increas'd by the disappointment which they met with from the Court. They had been forward (several of them) in bringing back the King, and had been flatter'd by several great Men that the King was for the Covenant. They had a Declaration from *Breda*, and another after the King's Return in their favour: But now when the Court was settled and they found themselves discountenanced and even contemn'd; that together with the Court there came in a flood of Debauchery, and all Religion was by some Men rail'd at as Fanaticism; and the name *Presbyterian* succeeded to that of *Puritan*, as a by-word in the Mouths of the Prophane to ridicule some

to the Church of England. 9

of the most serious and Godly Persons in the Land; They were invincibly prejudic'd against the Men, and against the Impositions for the sake of the Imposers. And if ever Prejudices might be suppos'd to sway the Judgments of wise Men (as we continually see they do) no wonder so many and so great ones were able to do it now. And if it be said, that many of these Prejudices were just, for our parts we do not oppose it; when stumbling blocks are laid in the way, it is sad both for them that give and take the Offence, But if it be said further, why did they not comply afterwards, when by time these Prejudices might be supposed to wear off? Why on the contrary, when they had examin'd and weigh'd the matters in Controversy, did they still continue averse thereunto? To this it may be answer'd, that the Cause of these Prejudices still continu'd, and some things superadded daily increased them: For, not to consider how far good Men may stand upon a point of Honour, when they apprehend themselves wrong'd, There were other things that must needs hinder the wisest Men from making so exact a Judgment of these things as they might have done under other Circumstances. There were Ill-designing Men that on purpose widen'd the Breach, and continually sow'd

60 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

low'd new Seeds of Discord. Popish Adversaries hop'd by keeping up the division, to gain at long run a toleration for themselves: Socinians and Deists did design hereby to destroy all Church-power and Discipline; some carnal Politicians intended hereby to hold a Balance between two Parties, which they could use by turns for their State-intrigues. What Lies were industriously spread abroad on both sides, what little Arts were us'd by these or other Enemies to beget a strangeness between the Conformists and Nonconformists, we list not to remember or repeat, though we would not seem to reflect upon the Ejected Ministers, any otherwise than for such Frailties as are common to the Best of Men, yet we must say, that these Ill-designing Men have made Tools of all sorts and Parties, if by any means they could destroy us all. Add to this, the continual Exasperation which these Good Men met with from their sufferings: Being cast out of the Church, they were soon rank'd with Fanaticks and the most hairbrain'd Sectaries; taken up with them without distinction for Plots against the Government after *Henry's* rising: This brought on Acts against their Religious Meetings under the name of Conventicles, by which they suffer'd much in their Persons, Estates and Reputations.

Thes

to the Church of England. 11

These were unlikely ways to make Conscientious Men to comply with the impos'd Terms, when they apprehended some that would have appropriated the name of *the Church* to themselves, to carry themselves as if they were Enemies to Prayer and Preaching. Thus were they so far from having their prejudices remov'd, that they were driven by reproachful Books written against them to defend themselves by opposing their Adversaries, which begat those Aggravations of the things scrupled, which we come now to consider, many of which had never (so far as we can find) been thought off, till 20 years after the *Act of Uniformity*.

Upon the whole, As we tell *some on the one side*, that it doth not follow, that the Nonconformists were a company of Factionous and Humoursome Fellows for scrupling things Lawful when commanded by their Governours, seeing they had all these stumbling-blocks laid in their way: So we must tell *Mr. Calamy on the other side*, that it doth not follow that the Terms of Conformity were sinful and unlawful, because these Good and Holy Men scrupled them or some of them, seeing they lay under such violent Prejudices and Prepossessions; Nor ought He to make such Reflections upon them that

con-

12 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

Conform to the Establish't Church, especially when Conformity is not altogether the same now as it was then, (as was hinted before) and when the Persons now Conforming are not in the same circumstances with the worthy Men, that He mentions. *We* lye not now under the Prepossessions that others did; *we* have had time to read what hath been written on both sides; *we* have seen what advantage the Enemy hath made, and seeks to make, of our Divisions; *we* have known what a Bulwark the Church of *England* hath prov'd against Popery; *we* have beheld what more peaceable Men, have succeeded in the Highest places of the Church. These things dispose the mind to think better of the things in controversy, than Men lying under the prejudices before nam'd could do; and being thus dispos'd, we crave leave to enter into the Lists with Mr. *Calamy* upon this Question, *How the Terms of Conformity are to be understood?*

Mr. *Calamy* seems sometimes to think that the opinion of some great Men, especially if hot contenders for the impositions, should Determine us in this matter. p. 503. He tells a Story of one Dr. *Swadlin*, which if true would make the Doctor sufficiently ridiculous, were it not that Mr. *Wood*, himself in his *Athene* represents him long before

to the Church of England. 13

as in a manner distracted by the great miseries
He endur'd. From a Distracted Man's mak-
ing the common Prayer to be all from divine in-
spiration and some irrational descants upon
the Office of Matrimony, Mr. Calamy is pleased
to say, that seeing some do make a plain Idol of
the common prayer Book rendered them [the Non-
conformists] the less fond of it. But what if
Men have made an Idol of conceiv'd Prayer
too, must we therefore reject it? Sure we
are, the Book of Common Prayer doth not
only own it self to be an humane compoſure,
but in the Preface to it, desires, that such just
and favourable constructions should be allowed to
it, as in common equity ought to be allowed to
all humane Writings; which we request Mr.
Calamy to take notice of, in the whole dis-
pute. Another Doctor Mr. Calamy names
with a greater Commendation from himself,
or from Mr. Henry in the margin. p. 509.
Where they who are not of the Doctor's
mind seem reflected on for dealing less
honestly: And yet we take it for granted
that Mr. Calamy hath a better opinion of
those who differ from the Doctor in what
he calls there *Stiffness* (and He declares so at
large in other places) only he would insin-
uate, that these stiff Mens explications of
the Terms of Conformity must needs be right,
that he may have the better Opportunity to
shew

14 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

show how hard and unjust they be. But we must once for all tell Mr. Calamy that these stiff Mens Opinion is by no means a Rule to us, and if we prove that the Law gives us a latitude by which the Terms of Conformity are rendered more easy, We ought to represent them so, and set them in a due light. But we only said that Mr. Calamy *seems* to make the judgment of these stiff Men our Rule to understand the things in dispute by, but *really* the Rule He goes by is, that we are to put the worst and hardest construction upon the words of the Subscriptions and Declarations and the things subscribed to, that the words will possibly bear: it is not meant, as, if Mr. Calamy did formally lay down such a Rule, but it will appear under every Paragraph (perhaps not one excepted) that He acts by it: on the contrary we lay down this Rule and stand to it, that it is most reasonable and the duty of every Christian to put the best and most candid construction upon the Declarations, Subscriptions and things subscribed to, that the words will properly and fairly bear; and that it is a great evil and highly unreasonable when words will admit of a double sense (neither of which is by Law or Custom determin'd) for any one to chuse the worst and most exceptionable

n
w
n
M
Pr
ev
th
sub
wh
laic
com
W
T
con

nale

nable. This Rule by us laid down, is confirmed by the Apostle's great Law of Charity (which is likewise the law of Justice) Charity, saith He, *thinketh no evil* — *believeth all things, hopeth all things*. This Law forbiddeth *evil surmising* as the great cause of all strifes and debates; and it may be thus argued; if we must put the best construction that we fairly can upon our Neighbours Words and Actions, much more are we bound to do so, when a whole Church is concern'd, and when the Charity is to be exercis'd towards our Governours, and towards a number of Persons whom We believe to be Holy and Good.

This Rule is farther confirm'd from its necessity as to all subscriptions whatsoever; without which there could be no agreement nor owning any thing in common amongst Men. It hath been thought a remarkable Providence, and a step towards Union (however Mr. Calamy comes to overlook it) that the Nonconformists have been brought to subscribe 36 of the XXXIX. Articles, which they cannot do without the Rule laid down by us, *that we must put the best construction upon them that the words will bear*. We'll Instance in one or two.

The eighth Article is subscrib'd by the Nonconformists; which Mr. Calamy having forgotten

16 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

gotten, doth bring in his complaint against the matter contain'd therein in a large Paragraph. p. 521. In his way of representing it, perhaps few could subscribe it; in our way both Conformists and Nonconformists have actually done it. The other *Article*, which we'll name, is the *Third*, which is wholly about our Belief of *Christ's descent into Hell*. Now if one were to try M. Calamy's way of interpreting Subscriptions, we mean, by which He acts all along, one must assert that the meaning must needs be, *That He descended into the Hell of the damned*; both because this is the most common and obvious Sense of the Word *Hell* amongst the People; and that it seems to be the sense of the compilers of the Articles, insomuch that in the M. SS. copy of the Articles sign'd by both Houses of Convocation, and now in the Library of C. C. C. in Cambridge there are added to the Article, as it stands now, these words following, *for his body lay in the Grave till the Resurrection, but his Soul being separate from his body, remain'd with the Spirits which were detain'd in Prison; that is to say; in Hell*. To this some will add, that this opinion of the local Descent into the Hell of the damned hath Antiquity of its side, and that the sense we now understand it in, is no Elder than Archbishop *Usher*, whose judgment

is so commonly now followed: Then compare this Article with Art. 8. where mention is made of two Creeds in which this Clause is that *they ought thorowly to be believed and may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture*, yet do the Nonconformists join with Us in subscribing this Article by the Rule by us laid down, *viz.* in the most unexceptionable Sense that the words are capable of, though perhaps not the most obvious. Now if Mr. Calamy will allow us to extend our Rule so far as to subscribe conscientiously this third Article (which he must do because we suppose he hath subscribed it himself,) then perhaps we shall not have occasion to strein the Rule so much in any one instance again. This Rule being thus grounded on Scripture, and the Necessity of the thing, *viz.* that no subscription can be made without it, we need not add, That it is highly reasonable; because as to things consulted of by great Bodies of Men, as (suppose) two Houses of Parliament or two Houses of Convocation (as the things in Controversy were) it is to be presumed that in composing and passing such Offices, Articles, or Declarations, the several Members had differing Sentiments, each Man abounding in his own Sense, if he could fairly reconcile the words thereunto: which

18 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

Doctoral Interpretation (as a moderate Nonconformist calls it) answers the Objection from our being tyed up too rigorously by the Sense of the Imposers; which is impossible to be known, unless they declare their Sense, or unless we can suppose that such great Bodies of Men had all the same Sentiments in the matter. This Rule, so many ways confirm'd, is all that is necessary to be granted in our defence of the *Terms of Conformity*, viz. *That the best Sense is to be put upon the Declarations, Subscriptions, and things subscrib'd that the words will fairly bear.* And if it shall moreover appear that this Sense is the most easie and obvious, and that the other Sense which Mr. Calamy would put on these things is most harsh and strain'd, then will the present Defence appear yet more to be grounded on Charity, Reason, and Necessity.

We come now to apply this Rule to the *Terms of Conformity*, in the Method propounded and observ'd by Mr. Calamy, leaving out the *Reordination* as not relating to our Defence and referring him for that to what Mr. John Humphreys a pious and Aged Nonconformist hath written on that Subject in a treatise by it self in 12°. so that

I. The first thing and indeed most insisteron, especially since the *Renunciation of the Covenant*

Covenant fell, is the Declaration of *Assent and Consent to all and every thing contain'd and prescrib'd in the Book of Common Prayer*; To which is added the Subscription requir'd by the XXXVI Canon, *That the Common Prayer contains nothing contrary to the Word of God, that it may lawfully be used and that they themselves will use it, &c.* The latter of these, viz. the Subscription is mention'd under some of the particular passages excepted against which shall be consider'd in the proper places; and though he doth not make any Exception against it at first, yet it may not be improper to hint concerning this what is more largely to be insisted on as to the Declaration, that though it may be fairly vindicated as to all the Particulars excepted against; that though some should be accus'd as doubtful and uncertain, yet none of them will be found *Contrary to the Word of God*; yet it seems reasonable that we are not to extend the Words to particular Propositions in the Book, but to the *Injunctions* therein, viz. that there is nothing requir'd of us to be us'd therein, which is *contrary to the Word of God*: and so the next words do expressly explain it, *that it may lawfully be used, and that the Subscribers will use it*, exclusively of all other Liturgies which the Book tells us were formerly *divers* in several parts of

C 2

the

20 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

the Land, *secundum usum Bangor, secundum usum Sarum, &c.* We do not find that this is much contested, we shall therefore come to the *Declaration* and Mr. Calamy's Representation of it, and his application of it so explain'd to the several passages in the Book of Common Prayer. Under every Head he seems to us to lye under very gross Mistakes; Our business will be to follow the safer Rule before laid down, and to give a better account of the *Declaration* and then of the several passages in the Liturgy excepted against

First, As to the *Declaration* it self. Mr. Calamy p. 503 makes the Design of it to be to *Testify their highest Justification and Commendation of every point and syllable, every Rite and Ceremony, every matter and thing contain'd in the whole Book and in every Page and Line of it.* The Injustice of such a Declaration he goes on to aggravate, and brings in the jesting Story of a poor distracted Man as the only proof of it. But let Mr. Calamy seriously consider, whether excepting his Dr. *Swazlin*, he knows of any one Conformist in *England* that ever made the *Declaration* in this Sense? and if he does not, whether that be not a sufficient Prejudice against it? But if there be another and a better Sense to be put upon this *Declaration* then by the Rule
before

before confirm'd. We are bound by all the Laws of Charity and Justice to understand it in that better Sense; and if after information any do again insist upon this bad and exploded Sense, they break those laws of *Charity, the very bond of Peace*, and are guilty of manifest Injustice towards their Governours and their Brethren. Now to put a better Sense on this Declaration, one must consider

1. What is meant by *unfeigned Assent and Consent*. Indeed all Assent and Consent must be *unfeigned*. A Man may make a *feigned Declaration or Profession* of his Assent, when he doth not *really* do it: But if he doth indeed *Assent and Consent* it must be *unfeignedly*. So that it is only the *Assent and Consent* that we are first to enquire the meaning of. And here one may observe, that they are *Law terms* and us'd in an *Act of Parliament* drawn up by *Lawyers* who do not distinguish of these words as some do, that the *Assent* respects the Act of the *Understanding* and the *Truth* of the thing; the *Consent* respects the Act of the *Will* and the *goodness* of the thing. Our Laws use these words promiscuously to mean the same thing. Dr. *Falkoner* observes that some Statutes are said to be made by and with the *Assent* of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, as generally all from the days

22 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*
of *Edw. I.* to *Hen. VII.* Others are by and
with the *Consent* of the Lords &c. as gene-
rally from *Queen Elizabeths* days; some by
and with the *Assent and Consent* of the Lords,
&c. as 1. *Jac. c. 2.* and 21 *Jac. c. 2.* and
it is most usual for Lawyers to put in many
words, of the same Signification, as in the
beginning of the Oath of Abjuration, *I do*
truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testifie
and declare. This being remembred, for
farther Explication, *Assent and Consent* may
be considered two ways. 1. There is an
absolute Assent and Consent to any thing
for the intrinsick goodness of the thing it self,
and every part thereof, and fitness above all
others to be used, without any consideration
or respect to any other thing from without
to sway our Approbation. Persons may
thus assent and consent to much of the Com-
mon Prayer, but none to all and every thing
therein: it being against common Sense that
so many Men should be all of the same mind
in so many Particulars. 2. There is there-
fore a *respective and comparative* Assent and
Consent; so a Parent that dislikes a match
on some Accounts, may yet in other respects
and to avoid greater Inconveniencies unfeign-
edly assent and consent to match his Daugh-
ter, and it may be his Duty so to do: Thus
they who dislike the wording of some things

n the Liturgie and are perswaded that it may be alter'd for the better, and some things made more suitable to Edification, may yet in the present Circumstances chuse to use it; and being perswaded of the lawfulness of the things enjoyn'd may unfeignedly assent and consent thereunto, and judge it *much better* and *more Eligible* to use it, than by refusal to lose the legal opportunity of exercising their Ministry; or to shew themselves disobedient to Authority; or to endanger the breach of Peace, Unity and Order. This *respective* and qualifi'd *Assent and Consent* is a proper Assent and Consent, and all that is necessary or indeed possible. This will appear more plain by considering, 2. What is meant by *all and every thing* to which they are to declare their Assent and Consent. And this is continually asserted to be understood only of *all things* enjoyn'd to be *us'd* and practis'd by them who make the Declaration *. Now as the former explication of the words *Assent and Consent* doth prove them not to signifie the *highest justification* of the things themselves, so this account of *all and every thing* will make it appear, not to be extended to *every point and syllable*, &c. as Mr. Calamy hath represented it. It will easily be obser-

* Falkoner's lib.
Eccle. p. 91. Sherlock's Ch. unity p.
105. Review of
the Grand Case. p.
13.

24 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

ved how many Objections against the Common Prayer this will prevent and cut off, when it is understood that by *all and every thing* is meant *all and every thing* that is to be us'd and practis'd. Now this will appear, partly, by the words of the Declaration it self, which is to assent and consent to all and every thing *contained and prescribed*; it is not spoken disjunctively *contain'd or prescribed*, but conjunctly by a particle that necessarily couples them; so that if they be things *contained* but not *prescribed*, the Assent and Consent doth not reach them. This appears more fully from the design of the Act, and this not only of the Act in general, which is *Uniformity of practice*, but of this part of the Act in particular, as any one may see by the words immediately foregoing. *To the end that Uniformity in the publick Worship of God (which is so much desir'd may be speedily Effected, Be it enacted that every Person, &c. shall read Morning Prayer and after such reading shall openly and publickly declare his unfeigned Assent and Consent to the use of all things contain'd and prescribed in these words, and no other. I A. B. do declare, &c.* If after all Mr. Calamy should say, that these words are capable of another Sense, in which he and others understand them and therefore refuse the Declaration. It may be answer'd, that not only is this

Sense

Sense more fair, unforc't, agreeable to the Sense of the Law by considering the connexion of the Declaration with what goes before, but if any person desires to express his mind in this matter at the making this Declaration, He needs only recite the words of the Act and speak thus. *Having read Common prayer I am required to declare my Assent and Consent to the use thereof. Accordingly I do declare my unfeigned Assent and Consent to the Use of all and every thing contain'd and prescrib'd therein, in these words and no other. I A. B. &c.* and if after information Mr. Calamy persists to charge the Declaration with the Absurdities that his Explication makes it full of, then *walks he not Charitably*, or justly, but acts contrary to the Method laid down by the Apostle and observ'd by himself in the subscribing other things.

Secondly, Having considered the Declaration it self and found it thus misrepresented by Mr. Calamy, we come to the particular passages with respect to which he denies it to be lawful to make the Declaration. Here we cannot but complain of unfair dealing in that several of the things mention'd are not prescrib'd or enjoin'd; and others which are part of what is prescrib'd to be used are quite mistaken as to the Sense and meaning of them. We shall go over them all and follow

26 A Defence of Ministerial Conformity

low Mr. Calamy in the order in which he sets them down.

1. He saith, *The Subscription and Declaration requir'd the owning the Doctrine of the Real Regeneration and consequent Salvation of them that are Baptiz'd, whether the persons baptized were qualifi'd Subjects of Baptism, yea or no.* In this Paragraph he supposeth and asserts that Ministers are oblig'd to baptize all Comers without a liberty of refusing the Children of Infidels, &c. which is a gross mistake, and should have been here set right, but that Mr. Calamy hath made it an Exception by it self p. 529. and is to be answer'd when we come to it. But that infants of those who profess faith in our Lord Jesus Christ are proper Subjects of Baptism is own'd on both sides; The Question before us is about the Privilege they receive thereby. Mr. Calamy asserts that the *Subscription and Declaration require the owning their real Regeneration and consequent Salvation.* For the latter, He cites the Rubrick at the end of the Office of Baptism, *That it is certain by the Word of God that Children which are baptiz'd dying before they commit actual Sin are undoubtedly saved.* To which it might be answer'd that this is no part of what is prescribed for our use, and consequently our Assent to use what is prescribed and our Subscription th

that the Book *may lawfully be us'd* doth not reach this ; Mr. Calamy must still be minded of this as we go along. But supposing that this were requir'd to be assented to, what hath He to say against it ? Why he saith, *it were well if the place were quoted, for they know of no such word in Scripture.* No ? Why then we will quote the place, and shew him such a word. Mark 10. 14. *Suffer little Children to come unto me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven,* Dr. Collins in the Suppl. to Mr. Pool's Annot. saith, *this may be meant of the Kingdom of Grace, or Kingdom of Glory,* and adds *Children goe to Heaven as well as grown Persons,* why then they are undoubtedly saved, and it is certain by this word of God our Saviour. Now we imagine Mr. Calamy will cry out, what is this to *all* Children ? Doth this Text say, that the *Children of Pagans, Mahometans and Jews* are all sav'd, *if a Christian Conqueror baptizeth them and killeth them all when he hath done ?* No, indeed, this Text doth not say so ; nor doth the Rubrick say so, nor mean so, nor without the manifest breach of the Rule laid down can be wire-drawn to it. It saith only, and our Lord saith the same, that *Children* i. e. *Some Children* are undoubtedly sav'd. The Compilers of the Liturgie never dreamt of such opposition from Protestants, and perhaps might

28 A Defence of Ministerial Conformity

might only intend to oppose the Papists, by declaring in this Rubrick that there is no need of Chrism or Confirmation for Children in Infancy, Baptism being the only Ordinance and means of Salvation they are capable of; that dying they go not into any place by themselves call'd *Limbus Infantium*, but into Heaven. Here was no occasion to speak of *all* Children, much less of such as had no right to Baptism. We know not what can be reply'd to this but the old Axiom *indefinitum aequivalet universali*, which is just such a representation of an Axiom as his is of a Rubrick, for it leaves out *in Rebus Necessariis*, it being well known that in an hundred other cases an *indefinite* cannot signify *universally*.

As to the other part of his Exception that *the declaration obliges us to own the real Regeneration of Infants*, we acknowledge that he quotes a place that is part of the office which we consent to use. *viz.* the thanksgiving after Baptism. *We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this Infant with thy Holy Spirit.*

Now here it is to be observ'd that there are Expressions to the same purpose in the Scripture it self. Baptism is call'd the *Lover of Regeneration*. The Baptiz'd are said to *wash away their Sins*, to be *cleansed with the washing*

washing of water, to be purged from their old Sins (even they who afterwards are said to have forgotten it, and to be blind not able to see afar off.) The Children of one believing Parent are said to be *Holy*; and again, *if the root be Holy so are the branches*. Now if these Scriptures may be assented to, then may that passage in the Liturgie which speaks but the same thing; and in what Sense we understand the One we may understand the other. It cannot be deny'd, that men have different Apprehensions as to the meaning of these passages in the Scriptures and in the Liturgie; some plead for such a *Real Regeneration* as Mr. Calamy speaks of, and suppose that it may be lost afterwards; most think that there is such a work wrought in some infants; but we humbly conceive that a *sacramental baptismal Regeneration* is fairly to be understood hereby. (See Testimonies and Reasons for calling Baptism by the name of Regeneration in Mr. Stephen Marshal's Book against the Anabaptists, p. 12.) They are said to be *regenerated* when *Regeneration* is there *sign'd and seal'd*, *Regeneration* being the inward and spiritual grace or thing signifi'd; and this being the manner of speaking in all Sacraments: *Circumcision* is call'd the *Covenant*; The *Lamb* is call'd the *Passover*; The *Bread* is call'd the *Body of Christ*; and *Baptism* is call'd *Regeneration*.
Mr.

30 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

Mr. Calamy is aware of this Answer and faith, that there is this obvious Reply, that the *thanksgiving* mentions regeneration by the *Holy Spirit*; He also quotes a passage in the *Office of Confirmation* where the same words are repeated with this Addition: *Thou hast given to them the forgiveness of all their Sins.* But why this last addition should be objected by him, who hath subscrib'd the Belief of *one Baptism for the Remission of Sins*, in the Nicene-Creed mention'd in the 8th of the XXXIX Articles, is not easie to tell. The Remission of Sins being therein seal'd or given, viz. by Covenant, according to the terms thereof, *Acts* 2. 38, and 22, 16. But the greater doubt that Mr. Calamy seems to have is from the mention of the *Holy Spirit*: *Thou hast regenerated them with thy Holy Spirit.* To which we say, that the outward Ordinances and Administrations are from the *Holy Spirit*, as well as the inward Operations are: *There are diversities of Administrations* saith the Apostle, *All these worketh that one and self same Spirit*: For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body. Though if we take the words by the *Holy Spirit* in Mr. Calamy's Sense, it comes still to the same, that the inward Spiritual Regeneration is the thing signifi'd and seal'd in Baptism, and the sign is call'd by the name of the thing signifi'd. And to

They

shew that this Sense is still the fairer and least strain'd, it is desired that these passages may be compar'd with two more: one in the *Office of the Baptism of the Adult*, where the same things are said of them that are Baptized at Age, that they are *regenerate and now born again*, which must be meant by way of Obligation, Sacramentally, seeing they are suppos'd before to have Faith and Repentance, and consequently to be regenerated; the Church declaring *that Faith and Repentance is requir'd of all Persons that are to be baptiz'd at Age*. The other passage will put the whole past doubt; it is in Act XXVII. Mr. Calamy is pleased to say, *The Liturgie and Canons are all of a piece*, which he doth to reflect upon the Liturgie: We shall discourse of the Canons afterwards; but if he thinks thus of the Canons that they explain the Liturgie which were made 50 years after, when probably not one of the Compilers of the Liturgie was alive; we may much rather make use of the Articles to explain any matter of Doctrine that is set down in the Prayers, when both were put together by the same Men and near the same time. Now the Article determines for the Sense which we have given, and which Mr. Calamy, we presume, hath given his Assent to. The words of the Article are, *Baptism*

32 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

is not only a sign of Profession, but is also a Sign of Regeneration or New birth, whereby as by an instrument, they who receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church, the promises of the forgiveness of Sins of our adoption to be the Sons of God by the Holy Ghost are visibly sign'd and seal'd. Here all the Phrases excepted against, *viz. being regenerated and adopted and this by the Holy Ghost, and the having forgiveness of Sins,* are all exprest to be meant of a sacramental *Signing and Sealing* of them; so that no scruple seems to be left.

2. The next thing excepted against is the *Use of Godfathers and Godmothers*; and we must acknowledge that the Assent and Consent and Subscription do relate hereunto. Let us therefore consider what Mr. Calamy hath to say against it. Why, he loads it with divers odd Misrepresentations, that he may expose a Rite in which the Protestant Churches are so generally agreed, and which we cannot wish to have abolish't, though we long for such Alterations as may prevent these quarrellsome Books for the time to come.

1. He saith, that the use of Godfathers *is to exclude the Parents and to juggle out their right to devote their Children to God in Baptism.* Here he mentions again the bringing in the Children of Atheists, Seducers, Jews and

and Infidels, which we have before refer'd to the proper place, according to his own Method, and shall there consider it; it serves only here to aggravate what he objects against; for, after all, we utterly deny that Parents are excluded or justled out by the use of Godfathers, but their Right is secur'd and their Benefit consulted through the whole. The use of Godfathers to represent the Child, as to their Answers before the Congregation, we shall account for, in answer to his next Exception against them; here we are to speak of their use, with respect to the *Parents* and *Children*, and their names may shew their design; They may be called *Witnesses*, viz. of the Parents Faith and Profession, that the Children they bring are born within the visible Church, that their Parents are known to them, and that they are not Jews, Infidels and Apostates, but professed Christians. Again they are *Sureties*, viz. to the Church for the time to come, that if the Parents live, and continue Professors, they will be assisting to them in the Education of the Children (allowing for the necessary hindrances by Death, Sickness, separation by Providence, &c.) And in case the Parents die or Apostatize, that they will more particularly take upon them the care, that the Children shall be brought

34 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

up in the Profession of the true Religion. Now what possible hurt can Parents receive by this use? In what Instance are they outed of their Right or excluded? To this it will be reply'd, that the Canon saith, *The Father shall not be urg'd to be present.* Which by the way is far from being part of the Liturgie subscrib'd to; but if we take it in, doth this exclude the Father, because his Presence must not be *urg'd* as of Necessity? Doth Mr. Calamy think that the Presence of the Father is of Necessity to the Administration of Baptism? We suppose, He will say, the consent of one (at least) of the Parents is ordinarily necessary, and that the Presence of the Father is highly convenient. To both these we can readily agree; Nor is there one word in Liturgie or Canon against either. The presence of the Father, though not *urg'd* as of Necessity, may yet be desir'd, and perhaps it is not wanting in one Baptism of an hundred, at the *font*, or at least in the *Church*; and in practical discourses Parents are exhorted to bring the Child by Faith and Prayer to Christ, which they bring to the outward Baptism. And should any particular providence detain the Father from Church at that time, How many ways may yea must, the Parents Consent be notified. Every Faithful Minister is suppos'd to be acquainted

acquainted with his Parishioners, to have beforehand instructed them and excited them to dedicate their Children to God. The Parents are expressly by the Rubrick requir'd to give notice of the time when the Children are to be baptiz'd, which is a sufficient Notification of their Consent, and Opportunity for the Minister to enquire concerning it, if he hath any cause to doubt of it. Lastly the Parents are to chuse the Godfathers which they cannot do without consenting, so that the whole of excluding them seems to be without ground. We go on therefore to the second thing.

2. He saith, the use of Godfathers doth seem to put Baptism upon an insufficient bottom. For the Promise of the Godfathers in the Child's name, is represented as the Foundation of Baptismal Dedication, and the ground of the claim of the Blessings thence arising. We cannot think that Mr. Calamy can believe himself in this Assertion, when the Right of the Children to Baptism, is antecedent to the choice of Godfathers, and when the Baptism is declar'd Full and Sufficient without them. That which led him to this mistake, is his confounding the Child's Obligation to the terms of the Covenant, with the Godfathers declaration of it before the Congregation. To set him right, the Ground and

36 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

Foundation of Infant Baptism is two fold,
1. On God's part, his gracious Promise to Believers and *their Seed*, by which He comprehends *their Children* within *the bond of his Covenant*. 2. On the part of the Children, their Obligation to the Terms and Conditions of the Covenant. This is consequent on the former, the Covenant being mutual. Thus we tell the Anabaptists that though Children are not capable of performing these Conditions for the present, yet are they capable of being bound and obliged thereunto. Thus a Child in Arms that hath a Right to a Copy-hold Estate enters into Court, takes the Rod (as the Custom is) into his hand, and is really bound thereby to pay Homage and quit Rent to the Lord of the Mannor, or he loses his Land. This being taken for granted, let us look into the *Office of Baptism*, and the *Catechism*, both which he excepts against. The *Office of Baptism* supposeth the Child's right on the account of the Covenant of Grace, extending to Believers and their Seed, and accordingly it is intended to represent and declare the Stipulation and Promise on both parts; what God promiseth to the Baptized and what the *Baptized* promise again to God. The *Minister*, authorized by *the Lord* so to do, represents his divine Majesty, acts in his Name, declares his Promise,

reads

to the Church of England. 37

reads it out of *Mark* 10. 13, &c. explains the meaning of it: Then the *Godfathers*, authoriz'd by *the Parents* so to do, represent the Children, act in their name, declare the promise that the Children are bound to. Here is no pretence of the *Godfathers Faith being made beneficial to the Child*, as Mr. *Calamy* would infer, but only an adumbration or *declaration* of that Covenant that the Children enter into, and what they would be engaged to, whether the *Godfathers* declared it or no. And this will fully explain the meaning of the words of the *Catechism*; where the *Catechis'd* are taught to give this reason why they were baptiz'd in Infancy, when as then they could not perform the Covenant Terms, *because they promise them by their Sureties*, &c. not as if their *Sureties Faith* supply'd the want of theirs (which is a groundless Surmize) but because, though they could not then actually repent and believe, yet by Baptism they enter into Covenant-Engagement, and promise so to do; which Engagement and Promise their *Sureties* declar'd in their Name. How far preconceiv'd Notions may hinder Mr. *Calamy* from understanding this, we cannot tell: But whoever sedately compares the *Office of Baptism* with the *Catechism* must needs see what is said to be very clear.

38 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

3. His last Objection is, that Godfathers open a wide door to the prophaning of the Ordinance: That they avouch a great untruth, that notwithstanding the Solemnity at the engaging in such a Promise, yet they never or very seldom perform it. Though they engage on the behalf of the Child, yet they hold themselves really bound to nothing, &c. with a great deal more to this purpose. But here again is nothing but Mistake and Misrepresentation. He supposeth, the Godfathers Answers to be the engaging themselves in a Promise, and that they themselves are bound *in the behalf* of the Infant; whereas it hath been already shew'd, that they only declare in the name of the Children, the terms of the Covenant of Grace, which the baptiz'd are bound to, but by reason of their Infancy cannot express: It is true the Godfathers have a superadded Obligation, mention'd in the close of the Office, to take care to instruct the baptiz'd, &c. but the Promise they make in the name of the Child hath a quite different tendency. The next is a stranger Mistake (if we may call it a *Mistake*) that Mr. Calamy should think that our Assent and Consent should respect the *carelessness* of the Godfathers. Doth he think that we do unfeignedly Assent and Consent that Godfathers should look upon what they do as a meer Complement

plement? Is there any such word in the Liturgie for us to subscribe to? That there is too great carelessness in *Godfathers*, as well as in *Parents*, as to the baptized Children, we must own in the sorrow of our Hearts: This hath made more Anabaptists than all their Teachers could do. Some speak of other Reasons of this Carelessness, which we (being wholly of the defensive part) will not repeat. But our Assent and Consent to their *use* hath no manner of Reference to other Mens *abuse* of this or any other part of their work. Though with all, we suppose, Mr. Calamy is too large and free in his Accusations of others as well as of us. Dr. Bray (who is better acquainted with Godfathers than Mr. Calamy) in his *Lectures on the Catechism*, saith thus. *I have known my self many instances of Persons, who owe that Understanding they have of Religion and the Fear of God, purely next under God to the care of their Godfathers and Godmothers, who have brought them up to Reading, &c. and I do not question but amongst the many neglects, there are thousands of like instances in the Nation, of Persons who have been happily brought up to a good understanding and Sense of Religion, by the sole care of their Godfathers and Godmothers.* Certain it is that more care is taken to prevent the Abuse, than many have minded. We are far from

40 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

thinking the Canons all of a piece with the Liturgie, as Mr. Calamy doth, but in this we could wish them join'd, that in *Can. 24.* it is order'd, *That no Persons shall be admitted Godfathers and Godmothers before they have receiv'd the Communion.* If notwithstanding this care there be many abuses, they are personal: and so far are we from assenting and consenting to them, that we do disclaim and abhor them.

3. The third thing excepted against concerns Godfathers too. Mr. Calamy saith, *the Assent, Consent and Subscription oblige Ministers to deny the Ordinance of Baptism to such as have not Sponsors, although they have a real right to that Ordinance.* This he grants, *some Question*: and well they may; but saith he, *upon very weak grounds*; upon very strong ones, say we. And we prove our Assertion that we never promis'd to exclude all that have not Sponsors, because there is no such word in the Book that we subscribe to. Yes, saith Mr. Calamy, there is. For *the Rubrick requires Godfathers, and the Subscription is to use the Form prescrib'd and no other.* We take it for granted, He means fairly; and by *no other*, He understands no other than what the *Book of Common Prayer* prescribes: And then doth not he know that there is a Form in that Book to baptize without Godfathers?

But

But He'll say, that is a Form for *Private Baptism*. We answer, True; and is not private Baptism true Baptism, and the same that the Nonconformists use in (by far) the most places at this day? perhaps he will ask, is not that Form only in case of Sicknes? we answer, No, There is not a word of *Sickness* in the Rubrick; but it is ordered to be us'd when there shall be *any great cause or Necessity*, or *when need shall compel*; and the Minister is left sole Judge of this *great cause or Necessity*. And certainly, if Godfathers cannot be gotten, or Persons do immoveably scruple them, this is a *great Cause and Necessity*. And though the Form there prescrib'd be short, yet is the Minister empower'd by the Rubrick to lengthen it as he sees good, out of the *Office for publick Baptism*. It may be said lastly, that Children thus privately baptiz'd are afterwards to be brought to the Church with Godfathers. We answer, no such thing is enjoin'd, but is only commend-
ed, as *expedient that the Child should be afterwards brought to Church*. And farther when the Child is brought thither, if it be baptiz'd by the Minister of the Parish, nothing more is mention'd, than that the Minister should *certifie the Congregation that the Child was before Baptiz'd*. If Mr. Calamy pleaseth to read over the *Office of private Baptism*, and compare
it

42 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

it with what we have said, we are persuaded he must with some sorrow review his Rhetorical Harangue, in the 510th Page of his own Book, to think how he hath dealt with us, suggesting as if we were guilty of *Impiety, Irreligion, Cruelty, and Unmercifulness, deserving to be unchristened and turn'd amongst Canibals, &c.* and all upon a Supposition that hath not the least ground whatsoever. This is a compleat answer to Mr. *Calamy's* Paragraph; But there is a marginal note concerning Dr. F. of *Whitchurch*, which would require a distinct Answer to that Doctor, were it not a Digression. Even the Holy, Positive Laws of God, to which we all give Assent and Consent do not bind *ad semper*, but give place to Necessity, much more must the Laws of Men. Parents cannot force any to be Godfathers to their Children, Ministers cannot force Parents to procure them; in many places they cannot be had; in some Towns there are twice the number of Children born, to that of Communicants who only are qualifi'd to be Sponsors. In these Circumstances what Obligations Dr. F. may lay himself under, we know not; we are persuaded, the Law hath laid him under none to be so stiff as the Margin represents him and commends him for,

4. The fourth thing that Mr. Calamy expects against is, *That the Assent and Consent and Subscription is to the signing of Infants in the Administration of Baptism with the sign of the Cross, and denying Baptism to the Children of such as refuse it.* This consists of two parts; The use of this Sign, and the denying Baptism when it is refus'd.

We shall begin with the latter first, because it is of so near a Kin to the former Paragraph. Concerning this he saith, that *wheresoever it [i. e. the sign of the Cross] is refus'd, Baptism is to be deny'd*; and his Reason for this is a very strange one; for, saith he, *the Subscription obligeth to use no other Form than that in the Book, and the Form of Baptism there inserted cannot be used by any that omit the Cross.* Now here it must be granted, that if a Minister doth omit any part of the prescrib'd Offices Scandalously and Contemptuously, he doth lay himself open to Censures; and if any should clamorously and openly *refuse* and disclaim the Ministers use of this Sign, when his Child is Baptiz'd, the Omission of it at that time might be deemed Scandalous: But that a Minister *cannot use a Form*, where upon urgent reasons without Scandal he omits one small part; or that by such Omission he breaks his Subscription to use *no other form*,
he

44 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

He perhaps is the first that ever asserted. But the full answer to this is, as before, that there is another Office of Baptism in the Liturgie, which the Minister is authorized for *great and necessary causes* to use, in which he well knows this Sign is not prescrib'd: And no one can or ever could by the Rubrick compel the Parent (scrupling as aforesaid) to bring his Child afterwards to Church, when according to that Office, it had been privately baptiz'd. Let us here again call Mr. *Calamy* to Repentance for his exaggerating expressions grounded upon such unprov'd Assertions.

But we come next to the use of the Cross, the lawfulness of which the Assent, Consent and Subscription do indeed acknowledge. It's true, Mr. *Calamy's* words are something ambiguous when he mentions the use of this Sign *in the administration of Baptism*. If by *in the Administration* he means *largely* the whole Office consisting of Professions, Prayers, Thanksgivings, &c. that accompany Baptism, he saith true: But if the *Administration of Baptism* be taken *strictly* and properly, The use of this Sign is not *in* Baptism but *after* Baptism; after the baptism is compleat and full and so declar'd, and so acknowledg'd by all. The Child is declar'd by express words in the XXXth Canon *to be before*

before by Baptism receiv'd into the Church of Christ, and as soon as ever the Minister hath pronounced the Words, *I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, the Infant is fully and perfectly baptiz'd, so as the Sign of the Cross being afterwards us'd doth neither add any thing to the Virtue and Perfection of Baptism, nor being omitted doth detract any thing from the Effect or Substance of it.* Let us now hear what Mr. Calamy hath to say against the use of this Sign after Baptism. Why, he saith it is suppos'd by them that refuse it, to be a *Sacrament superadded to that which our blessed Lord hath instituted.* A heavy charge, but manifestly unjust. And by the way, we cannot but think that much of the gross ignorance that many (otherwise knowing Persons) live in touching the nature of Sacraments, and why they be two and no more, is owing to this strange charge, and to the confounding of Sacraments with every common Sign; yea, perhaps, the *Socinian* Errour that hath dwindled Sacraments to meer Signs must be laid too far at this door. We doubt not to make it appear to all unbiass'd Persons that no one thing *proper* to a Sacrament is ascrib'd to the use of this Sign in the Church of *England.* That there should be an outward Sign of some Duty done or grace acted is not *proper* to Sacraments only, but

46 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

but *common* to many other things and Actions in Scripture, and the allowed practice of all Christians, and at all times; such as bowing the Body, uncovering the Head, standing up, kneeling down, lifting up the hand, laying it upon the Book, kissing of it, and many more. Three things are *proper* to Sacramental Signs. 1. that they be Signs from God to Man, of what Grace he will give or promise. 2. That they be a means appointed to receive this Grace, and sanctifi'd for that end. 3. That they be a Pledge or Seal to the worthy Receiver that the Promise shall be made good. Now if the Promise be *really* made and the means *indeed* sanctifi'd by God, &c. then is it a *Divine Sacrament*: If it be only *pretended*, and Effects only *suppos'd* to be wrought thereby, without any intimation of a Promise from God, or Word that should secure the Effect, then are they *humane Sacraments* set up in opposition to the Divine. And it is upon this account that we condemn the Popish Holy-water, Oyl, Spittle, Crossing, &c. and do sufficiently distinguish our selves from the Papists, and they know it. This will farther give us a fair account, why none but God can ordain a Sacrament, because we know, from the Nature and Reason of the Thing, that none but he that makes the Promise and bestows the

the Grace, can appoint the means and sancti-
fie the Signs by which the Grace is receiv'd
and secur'd: this gives us sound Reason, why
there are but two Sacraments, because we
find no other Signs from God, to which such
promise is made, &c. Let us now consider
whether the Sign of the Cross be any ways
made a Sacrament amongst us.

1. It is never pretended by the Church of
England to be any *Sign from God to Man, of
any Promise made by him.* But it is indeed a
Sign from Man to Man, notifying what the
Congregation expects from the baptized Per-
son. To this Mr. Calamy saith, that *this Sign
is made by a Minister of Christ, and receiv'd by
the baptiz'd signifying the work of Redemption
purchas'd by Christ, and the Grace given as the
Fruit of that Purchase.* Now if the very look-
ing into the Liturgie had not shewn him the
clean contrary, if the signification of this
Sign had not been expressly declar'd to be
quite another thing, it had been more tole-
rable to represent things thus; but as it is,
it looks very strange to us. For not only
doth the Minister change the number to
shew that he speaks not in the name of God,
but of the Congregation, saying, we *receive
this Child*, &c. but it is expressly said, to sig-
nifie [not Grace from the Creator, but] the
Duty of the Creature, *in token that he shall
not*

48 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*
not hereafter be asbamed; &c. Aye, but faith
he, the 30th Canon saith, *that the Holy Ghost*
did honour the name of the Cross so far, that un-
der it He comprehended not only Christ crucifi'd,
but the Force, Effects and Merits of his Death and
Passion, with all the Comforts, Fruits and Pro-
misses which we receive and expect thereby. The
Church of England hath still retain'd the Sign
of it in Baptism, &c. By this he would insi-
nuate, as if the Canon had said, that the
Church of England did retain the Sign of
the Cross, to signifie to us the giving Christ's
Death with the Effects and Merits of it, and
this because the name of the Cross, is said to
be us'd in Scripture to signifie these things.
But the Reader will perhaps be mov'd with
indignation against this way of Writing,
when he is told that what is said of the name
of the Cross is a side and an half in the common
Edition of the Canons, from what is said of
the use of the Sign of the Cross in the Church
of England: nor is there any manner of con-
nexion in the Canon between those two parts,
which he hath thus closely joyn'd together.
For though the name of the Cross signifie that
in Scripture which is there set down, viz. in
1 Cor. 1. 17, 18. Gal. 5. 11. & 6. 12, 14.
Phil. 3. 18. And this might give occasion
(as is there said) to the primitive Christians
to use the Sign of the Cross in the Profession
against

against the Heathens (which Mr. Calamy seems to allow of) yet doth it not follow in reason, any more than in the same Page of the Canon, that this sign is us'd to signifie the bestowing these Blessings, but it is said expressly to signifie our *not being ashamed to confess the Faith of Christ crucifi'd, &c.*

2. It is not pretended by the Church of England to be *any means ordained for the partaking of Grace, nor is any Efficacy or Virtue ascrib'd unto it or any use thereof.* Yes, saith Mr. Calamy, *it is appointed to work Grace by way of exciting Signification.* If we ask him, where this appointment is to be found? He must answer, it is imply'd in the Signification or meaning of it. And how far then will he extend this Objection? By this he may make every Spire of Grasse a Sacrament, because a Holy Soul may be excited and stir'd up thereby. However this is *common* to all the Signs allow'd by Scripture and constant Practice, as Kneeling, Standing up, &c. without which indeed they would be insignificant and vain. But to see how far Prejudice may carry Men, He adds, *Though in the Form of words us'd, the Sign of the Cross is said to be in Token, he shall not be ashamed, yet the generality are apt to understand it, that in virtue and power of this Sign the Person baptis'd shall not be ashamed, &c.* Either by the Genera-

50 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

lity he means those others who with himself make this opposition, and so change and wrest the words that they may speak against them, and then let them look to it. Or else he means the *generality* of those who comply with and use this Sign in the Church of *England* and then we challenge Him to name one single Person of any tolerable understanding for these hundred years past, that ever so thought or said. We are sure we never met with one, nor, we believe, he neither. Sure we are the Canon saith, *It is apparent by the Communion Book* (so the whole Liturgy was wont to be call'd) *that the Infant baptized is receiv'd into the Congregation, &c. by virtue of Baptism before it be sign'd with the sign of the Cross and not by any Power ascrib'd to the Sign of the Cross.* So that the ground of these Objections is contrary to the good Rule of Charity and Justice at first laid down.

3. And if it be not made to be a Sign from God, nor taken as a means of Grace, much less is it pretended to *be a Seal or Pledge thereof.* This indeed is not objected by Mr. Calamy, he seems to own *that it hath nothing in it of an Assurance on God's part.* Therefore, say we, there is nothing ascrib'd to it proper to a Sacrament at all. Yes, saith Mr. Calamy, *it is made a bond on Man's part, and the Canon declares it a dedicating Sign: and*

it looks as if Baptism were not esteem'd a bond sufficiently firm, but needed some addition whereby Men might be tyed the faster. How can it be that it should look so, when the Canon declares, that the Sign us'd doth add nothing to the Virtue and Perfection of Baptism, nor being omitted doth detract any thing from the Effect or Substance of it? The plain account therefore is, that the Covenant seal'd in baptism being mutual, when God appoints a Sign from Him to us, upon our receiving it we are engaged and bound to our part of the Covenant; but it is also certain that we may and ought afterwards to glory in our Bonds, to own our Dedication, and by all fitting means to express it. And though it be Usurpation and Folly both to appoint God, what sign he should use to us, yet we have sufficient warrant, by proper Words and Actions of our own, to express our Minds and declare our Engagements unto him. Nor have we any reason to think that any Earthly Prince would resent it (as Mr. Calamy thinks he would) if his Loyal Subjects, having taken the Oath of Allegiance that his Laws require, should afterwards by fitting Actions declare that they have done so, and were not ashamed to own it. Nor can a Sign be otherwise dedicating, than as thereby we declare our selves bound, continually to Devote and Dedicate

52 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

our selves from henceforward to be his. Thus every time we stand up at the Creed we use a *dedicating Sign* by which we declare our selves to believe in Father Son and Holy Ghost. We have thus gone through the whole of his opposition in plain Self-defence; and if any think that this our answering Mr. Calamy is not a sufficient vindication of the use of this Sign (though we verily believe it is,) we refer him to what *Bishop King* hath lately written on this Subject, where He will find these three things plainly and largely prov'd *viz.*

1. That *the Scriptures warrant us to express the Sense of our Minds by Actions as well as Words.* Indeed all Words are Signs too, and 'tis a part of our Christian Liberty, to use proper Words or Actions to testify our Minds and the Sense thereof; to express Submission by *kneeling*; Faith and Acknowledgment of God by *standing up*; sorrow, by *rending the Garment* or *lying in Sackcloth*; ratifying a Covenant-dedication by *Sealing and Subscribing*; Condescension to one another by *washing the feet*; being in Charity by an *Holy Kiss*; rejecting of Persons from the means of Grace by *shaking the Raiment*, and many more such like. Some of these Signs seem *naturally* Significant, others of them signifie by *Custom*, as Sealing, washing the Feet, the Kiss, &c. and

and some Customs have quite varied the Significations. They uncover'd the Head in sign of *Authority*, we in sign of *Reverence*. Thus doth the Scriptures warrant us to express our Minds by Signs and Actions which *Custom* makes significant thereof,

2. That to glory in our belonging to a crucifi'd Christ, to profess our being dedicated to him, and our readiness to follow him, is a part of our necessary Duty; and it is a very proper duty after Baptism, to declare our readiness to follow him to whom we have been given up.

3. That long Custom even from the first Ages made the using this Sign on the Forehead (which is the place of Shame) to signifie such a Profession or Declaration not to be asham'd of Christ. It is then a meer professing Sign like *Writing*, *standing up*, or *lifting up the hand* to signifie the Duty that we or others are bound to.

And now we conclude this with one observation, that though some passages of the Liturgy are capable of a double Sense, as that of *baptismal regeneration* (with respect to which the Rule is, that when there are two Senses of any words, the one more and the other less exceptionable, and there is no Declaration made in which Sense they are intended, it is most reasonable to take them in that which is least, and not in that which is

54 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

most exceptionable) yet in this case there seems to be no difference amongst all the understanding Subscribers to the use of this Sign. Here are no Dr. F's with stiff and rigid Notions to put words into the Mouths of the Dissenters against us: but all with one Consent (for ought we know or have read) to a Man, declare against such Misrepresentations as Mr. Calamy hath made.

5. His fifth Accusation is, that *the Assent, Consent and Subscription oblige Ministers to reject all such from the Communion as will not receive it kneeling.* This he saith was the only point manag'd in the *Savoy-Conference*. True, but that was a Conference with the *Imposers*, who were rigidly pleading for Impositions, and is nothing to the purpose as to *Submitters* (as will appear presently) to come to what concerns us,

1. He hints something by way of Argument against kneeling. *Persons* (saith he) *might have good reason to be backward to yield to the altering of that posture that was used by our Saviour in the Administration.* To which we answer, by asking him whether he knows any Church that doth not alter the posture us'd by our Saviour? If he replies, that *sitting* at meals comes now in the room of the *leaning* us'd in our Saviour's time; why then, say we, it is alter'd, and all have yielded to the

the alteration, Mr. Calamy and all. But he will say, he still retains a *Table posture*, and it was a Table Posture that was us'd by our Saviour in the Administration: we must answer by putting him upon the proof of it. It is true they did use that Table Posture at the Passover, the Text saith so (and by the way, that was alter'd from a Posture that signifi'd *hast*, to a Posture that signifi'd *Rest*, and our Lord allow'd it) but that he us'd this Posture in the Administration of the Lord's Supper is no where said: On the contrary we find that after the *Passover* was ended and before the Administration of *our Sacrament* He gave thanks; now we cannot at all believe that our Lord (who always shew'd such Reverence in Prayer during his Humiliation) did pray in a *Table Posture*; if then we suppose him to *stand up* or *kneel* at Prayer with his Disciples, the Gesture was alter'd from a Table Posture; and that he return'd to it again, we have not the least Evidence from Scripture or Reason. Another Argument that Mr. Calamy useth upon this head is, that *they have good reason to be shy of Symbolizing with the Papists who adore the Bread*. He well knows how shy others are of another Posture upon the account of *Symbolizing*, especially in a time when *Socinianism* doth prevail (See Bishop King of *Inven-*

56 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

tions in God's Worship, Ch. IV. Sect. 2.) but we will not take the Opponents part, but stand to our Defence: and here Mr. Calamy makes it for us, by owning that this Adoration is disclaim'd by the Church of England, only he adds, *it is yet apt to be misinterpreted*. But what will not Prejudice misinterpret? if a Rubrick made on purpose to prevent this Objection, so plain, so full, so vehement may be apt to be Misinterpreted, then no words can be understood.

2. But his main Design is not to oppugn the Ceremony of kneeling, but the *Rejecting such from the Communion that will not receive it kneeling*; This, he saith, the Ministers by Assenting and Consenting to the Book of Common Prayer must do. Let us turn to the Book and see what we subscribe to. It is the Rubrick after the words of Consecration, where it is said, *The Minister shall proceed to deliver the same to the People, in order into their hands, all meekly kneeling*. The Reader will assuredly say, is this all? Yes, every Word that the Book saith about it. Here is not any one Word of *rejecting them that kneel not*, and so making new terms of Communion, &c. Yes, he saith, *Give it to them kneeling* is Equivalent to, *Give it only to such*. But hath he made all his Representations so right, that we should take this upon his

his bare Word? The Sense of such words all along the Book are otherwise to be understood. The Confession in Morning and Evening Prayer is to be made, *the People all kneeling*; but if the People kneel not, the Minister must go on. Mr. Calamy himself saith, that *it was asserted by the Disputants on the Church side at the Savoy, that the Liturgy only requir'd that it should be given kneeling, but did not forbid the giving it to others.* But, he adds, *it was generally contradicted by the other Commissioners, and particularly those that were upon the Secret.* To which we answer, that therefore we are of Those whose Souls never entred into their Secret: We see Doctors differ. But yet, we suppose, the Reasons why those Commissioners oppos'd their Fellow-Disputants was not, because they thought that the words of the Liturgy requir'd Ministers to reject them that refuse to kneel (for it is plain that they do not) but because there was a Canon which went farther than the Liturgy, and which they had an Eye to: And indeed so hath Mr. Calamy too; for he saith, *there is a Canon that forbids Ministers upon pain of Suspension to give the Sacrament to any that do not kneel.* This, adds he, *explains the Liturgy.* Now that last Clause we deny; the Rubrick is plain and needs no Explanation, but the Canon hath added

58 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

added something more. But before we come to it, we must mind Mr. Calamy that it is the Assent to the Book of Common Prayer that we are upon, and if we have accounted for that, we have done all that is necessary in this place; and touching the Canons, we will discourse with him in another. When once a Minister is in danger of Suspension on this or the like Account, he must diligently weigh things on either side, whether the Person refusing kneeling appears to do it Humbly and Conscientiously; or Clamorously, and out of Design; and consequently which is most for the Glory of God, or most Lawful and fit to be done, to reject him or admit him under the Hazard that he is suppos'd to run: In many cases he must consult his Bishop, and shew the Reasons on both sides; but we say again, this is nothing to the Declaration and Subscription, the Lawfulness of which, we have, by the help of God, thus far defended.

6. The next complaint is, that *the Declaration and Subscriptions is an Allowance and Approbation of that Assertion that Bishops, Priests and Deacons are three distinct Orders in the Church by divine Appointment.* For in the Book of Ordination it is asserted that it is Evident to all Men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles

Apostles time there have been these Orders in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons. The whole Aggravation of this for above a Page together runs upon Mistake. We are therefore to distinguish between owning the three Orders of Bishops, Priests and Deacons continued in the Church from the Apostles time, and the owning this Assertion, *viz, That it is Evident to all Men diligently Reading, &c.*

I. As to the first, it must be acknowledged that the Assent and Consent doth contain an Allowance of those distinct Orders of Bishops, Priests and Deacons from the Apostles time, as he observes *the whole Book of Ordination goes upon that Foundation.* There are three Forms that are to be used, and we declare *may lawfully be used*; and the same is subscrib'd in Art. 36 of the XXXIX. And is this deny'd by the moderate Nonconformists? Mr. Baxter frequently saith, that the Commissioners at the Savoy on that side never spake a word for the Abolition of Episcopacy; one of them was actually a Bishop, several of them were Episcopal Men in their Judgements, and continued Conformists to the present Establishment. That Holy Man whose Life he abridgeth not only frequently declares his Judgment, but gives us Arguments which we never saw answer'd. In his

60 A Defence of Ministerial Conformity

his Epistle to Sir H. A. at the beginning of his *Treatise of Knowledge and Love*, he writes thus. *They that desire an Abolition of Episcopacy should a thousand times betink themselves first what true and primitive Episcopacy is, and whether the Episcopi Gregis & eorum Presides or true Evangelists or Apostolical general Bishops, disarm'd and duly chosen, be any injury to the Church: and whether the Jews had not been a national Christian Church under the twelve Apostles and the LXX, if they had not rejected him that would have gather'd them as the Hen gathers her Chickens under her Wings. They that cannot deny that Christ settled a superior Rank of Ministers appointing them, besides their Extraordinaries, the work of gathering and overseeing many Churches, promising therein to be with them to the end of the World; and that only Matthias must make up the national number of such, though Justus had been with Christ as well as he, must be the Provers that this Rank and Imparity was revers'd by him that did institute it, if they affirm it; and not without Proof charge Christ with seeming Levity and Mutability, as settling a Form of Ministry and Government, which he would have continue but one Age: much less must they impose such an unprov'd affirmation as the Terms of Church concord. Here is the Superiour Rank or Order of Ministers asserted and said to be settled*

by Christ which is the same with divine Appointment; and this by him whose Works Mr. Calamy takes upon him to abridge; though we quote it not for the Authority only, but for the Argument sake. We crave leave to cite one passage more out of his Book: *Of a Revolt to a Foreign Jurisdiction* p. 525. Thus he writes; *Have not the Old and many later Nonconformists advantaged Popery by decrying all Episcopacy or Imparity of Ministers? When it is so plain that Christ did set XII above LXX, and kept up the number by Matthias? and gave Power to Apostles, and they to Others, to be exercised over other Churches and Pastors? And when it is apparent that all the Churches for many hundred Years had Episcopal Government (though not such as Popery and Tyranny have since brought in.) Those call'd Hereticks and Schismaticks were for it, the Novatians and Donatists ever Zealous for &c. And will it not greatly confirm the Papists to find such Protestants reject the Judgment and Practice of all the Ancient Churches, and differ from the rest of the Christian World? This last passage will bring us to the consideration of the second thing. viz.*

2 The Assertion in the Preface to the Ordination-Book, that it is Evident to all Men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and Ancient Authors &c. The objection is this; that

62 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

that though perhaps they could have assented to the Use of the Book of Ordination and to the three Forms therein, yet they cannot assent to this, *that it is evident to all Men diligently reading the Scriptures and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles time there have been these three Orders; seeing Calvin, Beza, Blondel, Salmasius and many more reckoned up, may be supposed to have diligently read the Holy Scriptures and ancient Authors, and yet were of another Mind.* To this we answer, that neither they nor we are call'd to assent to it. This is part of the old Mistake: for this passage in the Preface is no part of what is prescrib'd to be used by us: it is a *Proposition* in the Book, but no *injunction* by it. This hath been clear'd before and the Answer stands firm here. But to take off all Cavils, let us consider what it was that these Men, *Calvin, Beza, Blondel*, and others that have diligently read the Holy Scriptures and Ancient Authors, were of another mind in? was it that there were not such different Ranks of Ministers from the Apostles days? No, *That Mr. Baxter saith was apparent in all the Churches for many hundred Years; and again, that was the Judgement and Practice of all the Ancient Churches.* What was it then? Why, he saith, Those learned Men held, that the Difference between a *Bishop* and a *Presbyter*

Presbyter was not in *Order* but in *Degree*. So that all the *Objection* dwindles into a strife about *Words*. What if that which they call *Degree* or *Rank*, be the same with that which we call *Order* or *Office*? may they not be the same *Order* in one respect and *different Orders* in another respect? The same *Order* in *Preaching* and *Administration* of the *Sacraments* (who doubts but where the *Book* saith the *Priest* may speak or act in *Baptism*, &c. that is meant the *Bishop* may speak or act, as is prescrib'd?) But *another Order* in *Acts* of *Jurisdiction*, as *Ordination*, &c. And that this may not seem harsh, we must observe how the word is us'd in *Scripture*. We read of the *Order of Aaron* in which respect all the *Priests* were one *Order* distinct from the *Levites*: yet with respect to *Jurisdictions* there were first and second *Orders*, as we read of the *Priests of the second Order*, 2 *Kings*. 23. 4.

Thus have we ended his first *Rank* or *Order* of *Exceptions*. He proceeds to six more.

1. He saith, *They, viz. the Nonconformists could not consent to pronounce all sav'd that are buried except the Unbaptiz'd, excommunicate and Selfmurderers*. To which we answer. Nor were they ever put to it, nor we neither. We shall distinctly consider the *Rubricks* or *Injunctions* about the *Office* of *Burial* and then the *Office* it self.

1. When

64 A Defence of Ministerial Conformity

1. When we consider what we assent and consent to in this matter, we take it for granted that this Office may be us'd at the Graves of some, viz. of such, of whom the Apostle saith, *we must not sorrow as those without hope*: there is no Objection made against the subject matter of the Office, but only with respect to the Application of it to fundry Persons to whose case it is suppos'd to be unsuited. Mr. Calamy saith, *Ministers are obliged to declare and avouch the Souls of known Adulterers, Fornicators and Drunkards cut off in the midst of their Sins, without any sign of Repentance from first to last, to be assuredly gone to Heaven. They are necessitated to pronounce them sav'd at their Graves, whom in their Pulpits they condemn.* Now must we seriously ask Mr. Calamy by what Word or Passage in the whole Liturgy are they obliged and necessitated to this? There is an Office whose Title is, *The Order of the Burial of the Dead*, but not one word that it shall be us'd, of all the Dead. Yes, saith Mr. Calamy, *all but the Unbaptiz'd, Excommunicate and Selfmurderers.* Let the Rubrick be read, and that will reach him otherwise. The Book saith, *Here it is to be noted, That the Office ensuing is not to be used for any that die Unbaptiz'd or Excommunicate, or have laid violent hands upon themselves.* But doth it follow that it must

be us'd for all the Rest? No, there is not one word about the matter; and if there be no such thing requir'd in the Book, how do they that consent to use the Book, thereby consent to use what is not there? Thus have we fairly answer'd his Objection, though nothing more should be said under this Head. We grant there is a Canon that threatens suspension to Ministers that refuse to bury any but the Excommunicate, &c. These Canons have been several times refer'd to their proper place: in the mean time, what is this to the Assent and Consent to the Liturgy? so long as that is secur'd, we have done what at present is requir'd. A Minister that doth nothing that favours of Obstinacy and Contempt, but upon rational Grounds when such a Corps is offer'd to be buried, shall (as a present worthy Bishop is reported to have said, he would do) take his Horse and ride out of Town, is in no great danger of Suspension. Though perhaps in some cases it may be more prudent for a Minister to use so much of the Office as is suited, leaving out those few lines that are lyable to be misconstru'd, for that time (in which he is not bound to use any of it at all) thereby preventing any Noise on one side, as well as danger on the other. But in other cases, we are so far from being

F

obliged

66 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*
obliged to bury these Drunkards and Whoremongers, and Persons dying openly impenitent, that we are peremptorily forbidden to do it. For there are two ways of Persons being denounc'd *Excommunicate*: The one, by the Law, either of God, 1 Cor. 5. 11. or of the Church agreeably thereunto; the other by the *Moath of the Judge*. We'll set down this in the Words of a Reverend Dean yet living, in his *Discourse of Church Unity*, p. 103. *There are two sorts of Excommunications allow'd in our Church. Excommunication sub judice, & latae sententiae. The first is when Men are formally Excommunicated by the Ecclesiastical Judge, The 2d is call'd by the Canon Excommunication ipso facto—now the Rubrick that forbids the Burial of Excommunicated Persons, doth not confine this to any one sort of Excommunication. And therefore if a Minister either in visiting the Sick, or by any other means finds any Man under this Sentence, though not actually inflicted on him by an Ecclesiastical Judge, yet he may by virtue of this Rubrick refuse to bury him by the Form prescrib'd in our Liturgie—This Authority is expressly allow'd the Minister, in repelling those from the Communion of the Lords Supper who are Notorious and open Evil Livers; and the same reason holds in the Office of Burial. Now then if there be not one word in the Liturgie enjoining us to use this*

Office

to the Church of England. 67

Office for all that die, and if we are forbidden to use it as to the Persons that he would insinuate, then is the Declaration freed from his Objections thus far. Yet farther,

2. When we consider the Office it self, the words seem capable of a much softer Sense than he represents them in. As to the declaring *our Hope* of our Brother's resting in Christ; it is evident there are several degrees of Hope, and the Minister may by a proper accent on his words express a lower degree of Hope as to some, as well as a higher as to others. As to the *thanks for the Deliverance from the Miseries of this sinful Life*. It is plain in the Letter, that wherever they are gone, they are freed from their Miseries in this World, and we ought *in all things to give Thanks*, and there are some particular Reasons for it in this Case. But the Words that Mr. Calamy singles out to descant on are thus set down, *the committing the Body to the Ground in a sure and certain hope of a Resurrection to eternal Life*. Which Words, saith He, *must necessarily be spoken with reference to the Person then inter'd*. The contrary to which, is not only the fairer Sense by the Rule of Interpretation before laid down, but from hence we have some light to understand the other disputed Places: for it is to be observed, that the Particle *the*, which Mr. Calamy

68 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

leaves out—*hope of the Resurrection to eternal Life*, was an amendment at the last Review of the Common Prayer, at the coming in of K. Ch. II. and seems to some to be put in to obviate this Objection, of its being spoken with reference to the Person interred: which if so, would shew that they design'd that the Words should be otherwise understood, than Mr. Calamy would have them; it being a very agreeable Sense to commit a Body to the Ground, in sure and certain Hope of that great Article of our Faith, *The Resurrection of the Body*, viz. of the Resurrection in general, and of our own Resurrection in particular, as it immediately follows, *who shall change our vile Bodies*, &c. And now we come to the hardest Phrase, which Mr. Calamy is largest upon viz. that *God in great Mercy had taken the Soul of the Deceased to himself: that is*, faith He, *into Heaven*. Now such Innuendo should be very clear; on the other side, we consider, there is a twofold taking of Soul to himself. The one, a *Receiving* them to himself *to live and dwell with Him*. The other, a *Summoning* them to himself to be *judg'd by Him*, to their eternal State. This last is spoken of in several places, *Job. 34. 14. 15.* — *God gathers to Himself his Spirit and Breath*; speaking of the Death of all Men in different

differently, who as to their Bodies are said there to *perish together and turn again into Dust*. From hence the Words in the Liturgy seem to be taken. To the same purpose is *Eccle. 12. 7. The Spirit returns to God that gave it.* The only remaining Difficulty is, how this is said to be *in great Mercy*, when the particular Judgment is such matter of Terror to Wicked Men. The account given of it is, That it may be a *great Mercy* for Wicked Men to be taken off when they are going on still in their Wickedness, whereby their future account would be so much aggravated and the Punishment thereupon increased: For which Reason *St. Chrysostom* doth earnestly insist upon it, (*Homil. 24. in Genesin*) that the Flood was a *Mercy* to the Old World, whereby there was a stop put to their Progress in Wickedness, which would but have inhanç't their future Reckoning: And that it is a *great Mercy* to Men in general not to be left to the unjust Judgment of Men and Devils, but to stand before a just righteous and merciful Tribunal, to be judg'd according to the Terms of the blessed Gospel; and though Wicked Men fall into the hands of *Satan*, yet not till delivered into his hands by a righteous Judge.

Add to all this, that there is no Dispute or Doubting about the Doctrine of this

70 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

Church, as to the State of them that die impenitently, now all Forms and Offices in a Church are to be understood according to the establish't and avowed Doctrine of it. After all, we still stand to our first Answer. The Office of Burial is granted to be excellent, when rightly apply'd: It supposeth the Exercise of *Discipline*, which every Minister hath promis'd in his Ordination-Vow to *administer*; if then the Dead be incapable of having these Words spoken of them, or the Living would be hardened thereby, then is not the Office intended for them, nor must it be us'd at that time.

2. The next thing he calls a *Trifle* and indeed so it is, about consenting to a false Rule to find out *Easter day*. The Words are, *Easter Day is always the first Sunday after the first full Moon, which happens after the 21st Day of March*. This Rule, He saith, is frequently false, and appeals to the *Common Almanacks*, &c. Others again doubt whether it be false or no; we suppose it depends upon some little turn of a Minute or two, between two days in which the Moon changeth, in which there seems great Difference and Uncertainty amongst skilful Astronomers: But that it frequently fails, as Mr. *Calamy* takes it upon trust, is utterly deny'd. And may we not consent to use
a good

a good Rule that generally holds good, because in a revolution of scores of Years, it hath been found to have some Exceptions? The only thing objected is, that the Rule avoucheth it universally, *that Easter Day is always on the first Sunday*, &c. and is not this the frequent way of speaking in Scripture, and all Converse, especially if the thing spoken off be of perpetual or long Continuance? So 2 Sam. 9. 10. Mephibosheth *shall Eat Bread always at my Table.* i. e. usually and Ordinarily, Job. 18. 20. *in the Temple whither the Jews always resort.* Acts 10. 2. Cornelius *pray'd to God always.* It would be absurd to name too many Examples of so plain a thing. The Rule is generally good, and as such we use it: Yea, it holds *always good*, i. e. *perpetually and for ever*, though with some few Exceptions.

3. The next thing excepted against is, the *Consent to use Apocryphal Lessons in the publick Churches.* In answer to which, we shall distinctly consider, how far we are obliged to use them, and whether it be lawful so to do.

1. How far we are oblig'd to use them. This is certain there is nothing to imply such a Prescription, but that they are found in the *Kalendar*, The general Title of which is, *The Order how the Holy Scripture is appoint-*

72 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

ed to be read. This indeed Mr. Calamy makes matter of Objection, *that they go (saith he) without any discrimination under the Title and Notion of Holy Scripture.* To which we answer, that if it be true, it is but what is common in all Speech, for the *lesser* and *meaner* to go under the denomination of the *greater* and *better* part: but perhaps this Title may be found to exclude the Apocryphal Lessons from being read. We are sure, that in the VIth Article we are told, that *by Holy Scripture we are to understand the Canonical Books*, there reckoned up, and those only, as distinguished from the *Apocryphal* call'd *other Books* in the Article, and there also reckoned up. So that though there might be some particular Reasons, why the Compilers might let those *Apocryphal Lessons* stand in the *Kalendar*, which might be peculiar to that time and now forgotten, yet might they not intend them to be read in Churches, but rather that the *Holy Scriptures* should be only read, according to the express words of the Order. And if any should think this a Conceit without Ground, and should ask what they intended should be read when an *Apocryphal Lesson* is fix'd to the day; we believe we can answer them from the Words and authentick Declaration of those Holy Men in the Preface to
the

to the Church of England. 73

the second Book of Homilies so highly recommended in Art. XXXV. The Title of the Preface is, *an Admonition to all Ministers Ecclesiastical*, towards the close of which we find these Words. *Where it may so chance some one or other Chapter of the Old Testament to fall in order to be read upon the Sundays or Holydays which were better to be chang'd with some other of the New Testament of more Edification, it shall be well done to spend your time to consider well of such Chapters beforehand, whereby your Prudence and Diligence in your Office may appear, so that your People may have cause to glorifie God for you, &c.* By which it appears that the bare being in the *Kalendar* was not thought by them to be a tye on the Ministers always to use those Lessons.

2. But supposing (though not granting) that the Order was to read them, we are to consider whether it be lawful to consent thereunto. And here perhaps Mr. Calamy may have subscrib'd as far as any Conformist in the Land: for the most that is said about their use is in Art. VI. subscrib'd by all — *the other Books* (meaning Apocryphal ones) *as Hierom saith, The Church doth read for Example of Life and Instruction of Manners; but yet it doth not apply them to establish any Doctrine.* Which is a plain Approbation of what he disputes against, *viz.* the lawfulness

74 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

ness of Reading *them*, under the limitation of *not applying them to the proof of any Doctrine*. Yet are there two other things that we may hint in the close, 1. That the *Kalendar* hath only the Holy Scriptures for Lessons on the Lord's days, when there are the most numerous Assemblies, and the Solemnity calls for all things that tend to the highest Reverence, as this of Reading the pure Word of God is one. And if a Holyday having an Apocryphal Lesson fall on the Lord's day, that Minister well deserves the censure of Neglect of *Diligence in his Office* imply'd in the beforecited *Admonition* who shall wilfully lay aside the Lord's day Lesson, and chuse an Apocryphal one. 2. That every Minister being a Preacher (as, blessed be God, all that are now ordained are) when he begins or ends an Apocryphal Lesson, may tell the People, in what words he sees good, that it is Apocryphal, and thereby prevent all abuse thereof, which fully obviates all the danger that Mr. *Calamy* can suppose in the Reading it.

4. The next Exception is in these Words. *They must consent to the Mis-translation of the Psalter*. Which in those terms is not true, it is one thing to consent to the use of a Mis-translated Psalter (supposing that it be so) and another thing to consent to the Mis-translation

translation of it. There are Faults in the Old Translation, and Faults in the New, and we must use a *faulty Translation*, or we must *use none*. And if we may *use it*, we may *assent* and consent to use it; and if we may *assent* and consent to use it, then we may *declare* our Assent and Consent so to do. We shall do here as in our Answer to the former Exception.

1. We enquire, how far we are oblig'd to use this Old Translation of the Psalms. We submit our selves to better Judgements, but we conceive, till we are otherwise inform'd, that there is no order for the Reading the Old Version in our ordinary Parish Churches. No? will Mr. Calamy say, when it is *mentioned in the Declaration requir'd of every Incumbent*. True, because it makes part of the Title Page which is wholly recited in that Declaration: and the Words in the Title Page run thus—— *together with the Psalter or Psalms of David pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches*: which seems to limit the use of this Translation to the places where they are *Sung* or *Said* according to those *Points*. There are near 10000 Churches in this Land where they are not sung or said according to those Points: Now the Order being only to use the Psalms, and there being two Versions thereof *allowed to be*

76 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

be read in Churches, we see not but a Minister is at Liberty to chuse which he pleaseth. But we acknowledge, this is not throwly home to the present purpose. We are therefore to enquire,

2. Whether the Old Version may lawfully be us'd, for some Use seems plainly to be consented to, *viz.* in those places at least where they are sung or said according to the Points; and if we think it lawful to use it in those places, we must judge it lawful to be us'd in others, if the Order extends so far. Against this Mr. Calamy brings a Charge implying, that this Version contains something *contrary to the Word of God*, and therefore not to be us'd. For proof of this he produceth Ps. 105. 28. where the Old Version reads. *They were not Obedient to his Word.* The New Version saith, *They rebelled not against his Word.* Here he saith, how could they give their Assent, that *they Rebelled*, and *they Rebelled not*? We answer him, it is true, *Rebelled*, and *Rebelled not* are contrary or contradictory, if spoken of the same Action, the same Persons and the same time, otherwise they are not. Thus *Bethlehem* was *the least* among the thousands of *Judah*, *viz.* in Walls and Furniture; but it was *not the least*, *viz.* in Honour and Dignity, because our Lord was born there. So in the present

present case, if the Words are spoken of *Moses and Aaron*, then we find by the History, *they were not Disobedient to his Word*: but if of *Pharaoh and his Host*, then *they were not Obedient to his Word*. But he will say, though both these are true in their different Respects, yet both cannot be meant in the Text. Right, but it may be very hard to tell which of them is meant. Let him but look into Mr. *Pool's Synopsis* upon the place, he may possibly find it past his Skill to determine which Translation is best: and if we must not consent to use a Translation, till we can Reconcile all the Difficulties in the several Readings, we are in a sad case. But to put all past doubt, we will give him uncontrollable Authority for the using a Translation differing in many things from the Hebrew, and consequently of this very Translation of the Psalms. He saith, by way of Objection against this Version, that it is *more accommodated to the Septuagint than to the Original Hebrew*. Be it so, then he knows very well, that this very *Septuagint-Translation* was made use of by the *Apostles* and *Evangelists*, even in those very things and places wherein it differ'd from and with the Hebrew. We are far from thinking that the *Septuagint* is to be preferred before the *Hebrew*, which is the Extream of some Learned

78 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

Learned Men the other way; and 'tis no less a strange Extream to think that it may not be us'd by us, which the Apostles did use and follow, which is so frequently quoted in the New Testament, and so many parts of it taken into it. And as we have given him the highest Authority for the use of the Greek Translation, out of which this *Old Version* is taken; so we will give him a Lower Authority for this very *English Version* which he excepts against. The Author of the Preface to the Supplement to Mr. *Pool's Annotations* (we suppose, Dr. *Collins*) hath a remarkable passage to be set before a Book, wherein so many Eminent Nonconformists were worthily concern'd—*To this day the Psalms, and the Gospels, and Epistles*; [it is a mistake as to the Gospels and Epistles, which were alter'd according to the New Translation; when K. Ch. II. came in, but the Author being a Nonconformist might not know it] *in our Service Book are according to Tindal's and Coverdale's Bibles, which should make us wary in our censures of that Translation, though we see reason in many things to dissent from it. Only we having a more correct Translation establisht by Authority, why (for the avoiding the Offence of less knowing People) we have not made use of that, but retain'd a Translation; not undertaken by any publick*

publick Authority, and confest to be more imperfect, is what I cannot, nor account my self oblig'd to account for, possibly God for the Honour of his Martyr hath so order'd it.

5. The next Fault that he finds is, the Assent and Consent to St. Athanasius's Creed, in which are the Damnatory Sentences; which, He saith, seem'd to them (the Nonconformists) very harsh, and they thought it unreasonable to be forc'd to renounce so much Candour, as this amounted to. Now must we seriously ask Mr. Calamy, whether He will stand to this or no? Doth He upon second thoughts stand to it, that they cannot assent to this Creed throughout? Why, they have actually done it, and Mr. Calamy, we suppose, amongst the Rest; and this in plainer and fuller words than the Declaration that He is speaking against amounts to. The Declaration only respects the Assent to the use of it, as was prov'd before, but the 8th Article subscrib'd by him is, that this Creed ought *thoroughly* to be receiv'd, for it may be prov'd by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture. And now the Readers will pity Mr. Calamy as the Writers do, for writing thus loosely, hand over head, and taking things thus upon trust without ever Examining them, and Condemning his own Act and Deed, that He may accuse us: He neglects to mention the known

80 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

known answers given heretofore to his former Accusations, and here He overlooks the Answer which He himself was oblig'd to make, if He knew what he did, when He subscribed the Articles; unless He saw with other Mens Eyes in what He own'd as well as in what He condemns. But if any should say, This doth not make the Creed the better, because the Nonconformists have subscrib'd it too; it is therefore necessary to answer his Objection. In the Creed it is said *which Faith except every one do keep whole and undivided without doubt He shall perish Everlastingly.* Now Mr. Calamy saith, that they heartily approve of the Creed, and esteem it an excellent explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, but could not think themselves call'd to Judge other Men, Damn'd for ever, who are not so well Skil'd in that Mystery as not to believe every word there Written. And He instanceth in the Greek Churches not receiving the Filioque in the Article of the Procession of the Holy Ghost. To which we answer (and, we suppose, Mr. Calamy will answer with us, now He knows that He hath subscrib'd it) that we are to distinguish the Doctrine of the Trinity and of the incarnation of the Son of God, from the Explications herein given thereof; and it is only with respect to the *Doctrines*, that we are to apply the Damna-

tory

tory Sentences : and then we make not our selves Judges, but only repeat the plain Scriptures which say, *He that believes not, shall be damned. He that believes not the Son* (which He cannot do without believing the Trinity and the Incarnation) *shall not see Life, but the Wrath of God abides upon him,* with divers such like. But, saith He, they must believe *punctually* the *Athanasian Creed*, and *every Word there written* under pain of Damnation. This representation we suppose He takes from the Words quoted; *which Faith except every Man do keep whole and undefiled* — now *whole* may seem to be as much as *punctually* and *every Word*. But if He did not consult the Article, we wonder not, that He should not look into the Greek Original of this Creed, by which He would have found, that the English word *whole* is Equivocal, it is not *ὅλν* but *σώα*, not *total* but *sound* or *safe*, which is explain'd by the other word *undefiled*. So 'tis not meant *punctually* of every Word or Point in the Explication, as He would insinuate, but *faithfully* as the other Word is in the same Creed; that the Faith be *whole* or *sound*, not rotten and polluted with *Damnabie Heresies*.

6. The last thing objected to, is the Assent to the Rubrick at the end of Confirmation; *that none should be admitted to the Hi-*

82 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

ly Communion, until such time as He be confirm'd, or be ready and desirous to be confirm'd. It would be very hard for an unbiass'd Person to find out what it is that is found fault with in this Rubrick; as desirous as we are of Alterations that might prevent Quarrels amongst Brethren, we would not part with this Rubrick for a great deal. This, if well observ'd, would prevent promiscuous Admissions to the Lord's Supper, and serves in great part to answer the Objections made against such Admissions, by clearing the Church-Orders from sharing in the Guilt thereof; seeing by another Rubrick just before the Office of Confirmation, at the end of the Catechism, the Minister is made Judge, who should be deemed fit or ready for Confirmation. Let us hear then what He hath to say against it: His Objection is not against Confirmation; for, He saith, *they were (many of them) very desirous to have Confirmation restored, and thought it would be exceeding useful, if manag'd with a becoming Gravity and Seriousness.* Nor doth He object against Persons being required to be ready, i. e. fit or prepared for Confirmation: The only Objection is against the word *desirous*, that this excludes Persons from the Communion that refuse to be Confirm'd the Episcopal way. Yet even here, He saith, *The*
same

same Persons are willing to own their baptismal Covenant Understandingly and Seriously, before the Church and their own Pastors: Why then, say we, they are desirous to be confirm'd; for Confirmation is such an owning the Baptismal Covenant, &c. Yes but, saith He, they may scruple this Diocesan Ceremony, and so by this Rubrick be cast from the Communion. Now (not to insist upon it, that the best Proofs we have for Confirmation do mention the Ceremony of laying on of Hands) it is enough for our present purpose, that the qualify'd Persons do desire Confirmation in the substance of it. To be desirous of any thing, which yet we do not obtain, supposeth some obstacle or hindrance: Now we confess the being actually confirm'd would imply a Submission to the Rituals; but Persons may be desirous of Confirmation, who yet by some things scrupled in the Office may be hindred from obtaining it; as we presume Mr. Calamy might be desirous of Episcopal Ordination, though by reason of some things scrupled in Conformity He could not receive it. Now if they be ready and desirous to be confirm'd, they are to be admitted to the Lord's Supper, though they be not actually Confirm'd.

Thus have we gone over Mr. Calamy's twelve particular Paragraphs, depending

84 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

upon his general Accusation of the *Declaration* and *Subscription* to the Liturgy; and have plainly prov'd, that there is not one of them, in which the things found fault with are not mistaken, and strain'd, and forc'd by wrong Construction and Application. And we cannot but beseech and admonish Him as a Brother in the Lord, to consider whose work he hath been doing, and whom He gratifies by these Misrepresentations of us. He knows the Ministry of *England* to be set for the Defence of the Gospel at this day against Deists, Socinians and a numerous Company of Blasphemous Adversaries of all Religion (as they were a while ago against the Popish Adversaries.) And He might easily guess, that what words he puts into their Mouths against us, by this way of discoursing, they will be sure to use against all Religion, as Priest-craft, and against the Ministry in general, or, as they express it, Priests of all sorts.

We come next to another Head of greater Mistakes and Misrepresentations.

II. Mr. *Calamy* saith, They were required to take the Oath of Canonical Obedience, and swear Subjection to their Ordinary, according to the Canons of the Church. Which Ambiguous Words according to the Canons of the Church, are put in by Himself to serve a strange

strange purpose that we shall come to presently. He recites *the Promise at Ordination* rightly, as also *the Oath*. The Words of both seem set together with wonderful Care and Caution to prevent Scruples and Quarrels. The Promise to *Obey those to whom is committed the Charge and Government over us*, is limited by two Expressions sufficiently explaining the Sense, *viz. following with a glad Mind and Will their Godly Admonitions, and submitting to their Godly Judgments*. The Oath is of *Canonical Obedience* to their own Bishop only and His Successors, and expressly limited by these Words, *in all lawful and honest things*. Let us now consider his Exceptions against this Promise and Oath.

1. He represents this as a binding Ministers by Oath to all the Canons. So that, He saith, *Though in the Oath there be a limitation in Words, yet they [the Nonconformists] plainly saw, it was only to be extended to future Commands, while an Obligation to comply with the things antecedently requir'd by the Canons as lawful and honest, was suppos'd and taken for granted*. Upon this He reckons up the several Canons in nine or ten Pages, to which He supposeth the Ministers to be bound by Oath, saying that they *swear Subjection to them, oblige themselves to consent to them, &c.* We shall return him a fair and large Answer. G 3 It

86 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

It is no small Prejudice at first against this Representation, that we cannot meet with any one Person that ever had such a thing in their thoughts, or at least that ever Published such a Supposition, till the Book quoted in his Margin, call'd *Nonconformity stated and argu'd* came out in the Year 1689, when that Holy Man wrote in Old Age, and in great and continued Pain. The Canons here spoken of had been then made almost 90 Years, and the Oath taken by the Ministers from the very first Reformation. Conformists and Nonconformists took it. Indeed *Canne* and the Separatists were against the Oath, because of their dislike of the Order of Bishops, but had they dreamt that it was intended to swear Men to all the Canons, what fairer Flings might they have had at it? On the contrary, Mr *Baxter* in his *Christian Directory*, Part. 3. Qu. 153. hath these Words. *The Old Nonconformists who thought the English Prelacy an unlawful Office, yet maintain'd that it is lawful to take the Oath of Canonical Obedience, because they thought it was impos'd by the King and Laws, and that we swear to them not as Officers claiming a Divine Right in their Spiritual Government, but as Ordinaries or Officers made by the King, to exercise so much of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction under Him, as He can delegate — if Prelacy were*

were prov'd never so unlawful, no doubt but by the King's Command we may Swear or perform formal Obedience to a Prelate as he is the King's Officer. Of the Nonconformists Judgment in this, read Bradshaw against Canne. All this shews that neither the Old Nonconformists, nor Mr. Baxter at that time, had ever heard of such an Assertion as Mr. Calamy advanceth now, that the Oath bound Men to obey all the Canons; multitudes of which are unknown, many Obsolete. and not a few Impossible. Towards the end of the handling the same Question, Mr. Baxter gives his own Judgment for the taking this Oath.

— If it be not only their own Ambition which imposeth it, but either the King and Laws command it, or Necessity require it, for the avoiding of a greater Evil, it may be Lawful and a Duty to take an Oath of Obedience to a Lawful Presbyter or Bishop, because 1. It is our Duty to obey them. 2. And it is not forbidden us by Christ to Promise or Swear to do our Duty, (even when they may Sin in demanding such an Oath) If an Officer be lawful in the Essential Parts, and yet have unlawful Integrals or Adjuncts, or be abus'd in Exercise, it will not by such Additions or Abuses be made unlawful to Swear Obedience to the Officer as such. Which last Words are as full a Confutation of Mr. Calamy's Notion, and the ten Pages that

88 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

He builds upon it, as if spoken on purpose for that end.

Our next Answer is, That Mr. Calamy's Accusation in this matter, turns in full force upon Himself, and upon those whom He pretends to be for; and He can no ways extricate Himself from the Force of it, but in the same way He must let us out too. We take it for granted that Mr. Calamy hath, or, before this Writing is Published, will have taken the Oath of Allegiance to *Queen Anne*, which *Allegiance* is an Obligation to *legal Obedience*, and the very Word *Obedience* is join'd with it in the *Abjuration* contain'd in the same Oath. Now let any one take up Mr. Calamy's Words, p. 523, and write thus. *Because all Obedience hath an Essential Relation to the Laws and Mandates of those whom Persons are bound to obey — therefore the Oath of Allegiance, which hath a reference to the Stated Laws and Canons of the Church [and State] carries in it a plain Obligation to comply with them, and submit to them in their Stated Practice, where they have not a Dispensation.* To this Mr. Calamy will presently reply; so it doth, the Oath obligeth us to observe the Queens Laws, so be it they be *Lawful* [by God's Law,] and *honest*, or fit for a Christian, and *English* Man to perform. Very well, allow it, That
that

that Limitation is meant, though not expressed in the *Oath of Allegiance*; then let us go on with Mr. Calamy's Words. *Though the Allegiance be limited to things lawful and honest, yet is it evidently suppos'd, that the Laws which are in Force do require no other than such things, without leaving Persons at Liberty, which Laws they'll obey, and which they'll refuse* — so that this Limitation is only to be extended to [the Queens] future Commands, while an Obligation to comply, with the things antecedently requir'd by the Laws as Lawful and Honest, is suppos'd and taken for granted. Now when his own Words thus fall upon Him, they will grind Him with the same Canons that He hath produc'd in so many Pages. He must then by his Oath consent to all the *Excommunicating Canons* (the Reader will pardon us, 'tis his own way of reasoning) and *Swear Subjection to the Rest*, for these are the Queen's Ecclesiastical Laws, as in the forecited place of Mr. Baxter, it is said directly, they are *materially Ecclesiastical but formally magistratical*; being of no Validity without the Royal Assent; and that by virtue of an Act of Parliament, viz. 25 Hen. 8. ch. 19. *Establishing Canons that have the Royal Assent, so be it they are not contrary to any Statute Laws of the Land.* He will be in the same Condition as to Statute Laws
also,

90 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

also, and those *antecedent* to his taking this Oath. The Queens Laws command the *keeping of Lent* by refraining from Flesh, unless there be a Licence from the Ordinary. The Queens Laws require all *manner of Persons to hear Morning and Evening Prayer in their Parish Church, or Chappel every Lord's day, &c.* Now either He hath bound Himself to conform to these and many more such Laws, or He hath not. If He hath, let Him then aggravate and exaggerate things to Himself, as to these and such like Laws, as He doth to us in respect of the Canons. If He saith, that He is not bound to these Laws by the Oath of Allegiance, then let Him explain the Obligation that the Oath to the Queen lays Him under, and the Answer will serve as to the other that He is speaking against.

The Reader will pardon us, if to prevent all Objections, we repeat something of what we have said, and apply it to the Oaths which are taken to subordinate Governours. Mr. Calamy's Interpretation of this Oath, would make the like Oath unlawful in Cities and Corporations, which the Citizens take to their Mayors or Governours. The Oath of every Freeman of *London* is large, the second Clause of which is in these Words—*Obeysant and Obedient, ye shall*

shall be to the Mayor and Ministers of the City.
 —Now if Mr. Calamy should tell the Citizens of London (for He is a Preacher within the Liberties of that City) *that Obedience hath an Essential Relation to Laws, &c.* That the *Acts of Common Council* are the Stated Laws of the City, that the Oath of Obedience to the *Mayor and Ministers of the City*, hath reference to those *Acts of Common Council, &c.* If He should then reckon up all the Acts of Common Council that have been made these hundred Years past, against which He can find any Exception, and should then tell the Citizens, that unless they can swear to those Acts of Common Council they must not be Freemen, or take the Oath of a Freeman; we believe that they who may like his Book against us, would not like the Application to themselves: they would angrily tell Him, that though the Oath expresses it not, it doubtless means, that they must obey the *Mayor and Ministers of the City*, in *lawful* things, and things *honest*, or fitted to Citizens of London. And if He then tells them, that *that Limitation will do for future Commands, but all things antecedently requir'd by the Acts of Common Council, must be taken for granted to be Lawful and Honest*, and so must be Sworn to; we believe that the Citizens would
 laugh

92 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

laugh at the distinction, as trifling and humourfome. Now if he does not, and dare not speak thus to Citizens of *London*, why doth He *use divers Weights and Measures*, and strain matters to a Sense contrary to his own in like cases, and indeed to the Sense of all Mankind?

We may add to this the consideration of the Absurdities of such an Interpretation, *viz.* that *the Oath of Canonical Obedience is to Swear to the Canons*; for if this were the meaning of the Oath, it would be an equal binding him that takes the Oath to all the Bishops who are equally concern'd in the Canons, whereas it only respects the Bishop of the Diocese in which the Minister lives. Nay (which is worse) it would not only bind Men to the Canons of 1603, but to multitudes of others in former national and provincial Synods, which are still by the Act declar'd in Force so far forth as they are not contrary to the Laws of God and this Realm: the like may be said of the Canons of general Councils, at least of them that are own'd in this Land. It would require ten Years Study of the Canon-Law to have any tolerable acquaintance with the Laws, that He would suppose us sworn to. Lastly, This would be to render the Limitation in the Oath useles, and ridiculous, *viz. in all things*

things Lawful and Honest. Mr. Calamy's distinction of *the future Commands*, to which He supposeth it to extend, and *things antecedently requir'd*, to which he thinks it doth not extend, hath been shewn to be arbitrary and worse. It hath been already observ'd, that this Limitation is always understood in all Oaths and Promises made to Kings, Mayors or other Governours, without which they cannot be taken: and it hath been always believ'd (till Prejudice sought to darken it) to be a peculiar tenderness in the Framers of this Oath to express the Limitation, to prevent (if it might be) Cavils in some, and Scruples in others.

We would fain hope, that by this time Mr. Calamy will allow us the same Candour and Justice, in the understanding this Oath and Promise, as He gives and takes in others of the like nature. Mr. Baxter hath told us, how the *Old Nonconformists understood this Oath and took it*. We grant that we thereby own the Bishops Jurisdiction and Government, as truly as the Citizens do that of the Mayor: We grant also that the Question about *the Obligation of Humane Laws*, is not without its Difficulties; large Treatises are written about it: Mr. Calamy and the Nonconformists are equally concern'd with us in the Disquisition of it. The
Reader

94 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

Reader may see many excellent things touching the Canons in particular, in *Bishop Stillingfleet's Ecclesiastical Cases*. He observes p. 374. How some Canons are alter'd by subsequent Laws, (as all those Excommunicating Canons which take up three or four Pages are repeal'd by the Act of Toleration.) Others have the Force of their Obligation, abated by general Disuse, being matters of no great Consequence to the good of the Church or the Rights of other Persons. Again, p. 378. the Bishop explains this not to be meant of Customs taken up by disaffected Persons, shewing Disobedience and Contempt. And He there determines, That bare neglect doth not imply Contempt in it self, but where there is Admonition and Continuance after it; but where the disuse of a thing is general, not out of Contempt, but upon other Reasons, and there is no Admonition by Superiours, but a tacit Connivance, there is a Presumption of a Consent towards the laying aside a strict Obligation of the Canons relating to it. So that the utmost that can be meant by the Oath of Canonical Obedience, is in these two things.

1. That we will pay a regular and legal Obedience (for so the Word *Canonical* signifies) to the Commands, Orders and Mandates of the Bishop of that Diocese in which we are, so far forth as we judge them agreeable

agreeable to the Laws of God, and of this Realm [*i. e. in licitis*] and proper and suited to our State and Place in the Church. [*i. e. in honestis*] that especially we will follow all Godly Admonitions, and observe those Orders that tend to the advancing the Glory of God, and serious Godliness.

2. That if he command any thing hard and pressing upon our Consciences, we will modestly petition and represent the Case to him [*rescribere*] and if we cannot obtain a relaxation of the hard Command, we will patiently submit to the Penalty, which the Laws of the Land (under which are comprehended the Canons of the Church) shall lay upon us.

But saith Mr. Calamy, we have not found any Bishop of the Land free to allow to any of their Clergy, that they should be at Liberty; which Canons they'll obey, and which they'll refuse. To which we answer, it would be ridiculous if they should: No Judge at Westminster Hall, when He takes the Oath of Allegiance, will be free to allow Mr. Calamy to be at Liberty, what Laws of the Queen He will obey, and which He'll refuse. But every Judge and much more every Bishop (if consulted) will inform us, that we must not obey Queen or Bishop, or any Governor, in what we judge contrary to the Law

Law and Will of God upon pain of Damnation; but if we cannot comply, we must submit our selves to the Penalty which the Law inflicts, without a Scandalous and Contemptuous Rebellion, which is contrary to Obedience.

Having thus shewn the great Mistakes that Mr. *Calamy* lay under about the Oath of Canonical Obedience, it might seem unnecessary to speak of the particular Canons, seeing the fault He finds with them depends upon his Mistake of the manner of our Obligation to them. Yet to make all things as clear as may be, we shall rank the Canons which he sets down under these two Heads.

1. Such in which we have no manner of Concern, as no ways relating to us or our Ministry. Such are the Canons that threaten Excommunication on the Depravers of the Liturgy. Can. IV.—*Of the 39 Articles.* Can. V.—*Of the Ceremonies.* Can. VI.—*Of the Church Governours.* Can. VII.—*Of the Form of Ordination.* Can. VIII. upon those that separate. Can. IX. X. XI. LVII. On *Revolters after Subscription.* Can. XXXVIII. On *Denyers of the Church Representative.* Can. CXXXIX. CXL. CXLI. All these Canons Mr. *Calamy* recites, and aggravates the Evil of them; and if any think themselves concern'd, they may enquire

quire into his manner of representing these things, as we have done in others: For our own parts, we are no ways concern'd in any of them. Suppose that our Promise to obey the Bishop, had been to obey all the Canons (we deny it; but suppose it had) what is this to those Canons that contain no Order or Command to us at all? Can we obey where there is no Command? Yes, but He saith, *that they* [i.e. the silenced Ministers] *could not conform nor consent to these.* We answer directly, nor was it ever required of them; no more than the Oath of Allegiance ties him to consent to all the Orders and Rules of the *Court of Chancery*, and the other *Courts in Westminster Hall.* But it may be said: "Though we are not concern'd as to any thing commanded in these Canons, yet these Excommunications may come to us to be Published, and then we are concern'd therein." To which we answer, that this was indeed the meaning of the Author of *Nonconformity stated*; out of which Mr. *Calamy* takes these things, (which Book was Printed that very Year, when these Excommunicating Canons were vacated by a Subsequent Law) But then, this is nothing to Mr. *Calamy's* way of arguing against them, as if we were bound to consent to them: As to the case of Publishing Ex-

98 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

nications, it is by Mr. *Calamy* reserv'd to another place, and will be considered when we come to it, for under these Heads He doth not so much as mention it, but wholly mistakes the State of the Case, and the Sense of the Author out of which He takes it.

2. The other Canons are such as do indeed require something of us to be observ'd and obey'd. And here Mr. *Calamy* is full of Mistakes, partly, in that He supposeth the Promise of Obedience to a Governour, to comprehend a Consent to the Goodness and Expediency of all the Laws, which He governs by: which is notoriously false, unless by taking the Oath of Allegiance He hath consented to the Goodness and Expediency of every Act of Parliament in Force since the days of *K. Wil. I.* And partly (which is more strange) in that he supposeth, that when we promise to obey a Governour, we consent to all the Hardships that his Laws put upon others, that cannot obey them as we do: For, He saith, *that though they* [viz. some Nonconformists] *could have submitted to wear the Surplice, yet they durst not concur in the Suspension of others, who were more scrupulous of it than themselves*; which is just such a Representation, as if we should say, that all who took the Oath of Allegiance

in

in K. Charles II's Days (which, He saith, *the Nonconformists did not scruple*) especially if they themselves went to Church, and took the *Oxford Oath*, *did concur* in all the Penalties that the Laws laid upon their Brethren, *that were more scrupulous than themselves*. The most that can be desired of us, or that such Promises can mean, is, That we obey so far as we *in Conscience* and *Honesty* can, and if we cannot that we submit to the Penalty. This being granted (as how can it be deny'd?) it is very easy to go over the rest of the Canons, which he sets down.

1. By Can. XXVII. *No Minister is willingly to administer the Communion to any but them that kneel*. This, He saith, *was spoken of before*; and it was answer'd before. If it appears to the Minister, that He that refuseth to kneel, doth it out of Contempt and Design, He must obey and refuse him. But whoever knew any Bishop in our days require the casting off a humble scrupulous Person from the Communion, for the sake of a gesture, when the case is fairly represented to Him? And should we suppose a Minister under so rigorous a Bishop, and to have so scrupulous Persons to deal with, if He should be forc'd in this and other instances to some Hardship; and if it comes to Sus-

pension, He must patiently bear it. There can be no *Government* so compleat amongst Men, but Circumstances may be imagined in which a conscientious tender Man may be under hardship by the Laws: Though (blessed be God) it is not like to happen in the Case before us.

2. The like Answer in great part may serve as to Can. XXVIII. where *Ministers are requir'd to refuse Communicants coming from other Parishes*; though indeed this Canon is exprest with greater Latitude, and seems to lay the Injunction upon the Churchwardens. It is here presum'd, that it is not understood of such, as being ordinarily Communicants in their own Parishes, do come occasionally to another, when they have no Communion at their own. Bishop King tells us, that in *Ireland*, they have purposely the Communion at several times, *by changing the Month days in several Churches, that People, who are devoutly dispos'd, may have the Opportunity of receiving Weekly.* *Disc. of Invent. in God's Worship.* Ch. V. Sect. 2. and the Reason is yet greater, in case there be no Ministers, or no Administration of that Ordinance in their own Parishes at all. We see no great difficulty that a Prudent Minister can be in from this Canon; but if there should in some rare Cases happen such a Hardship,

Hardship, the Minister must shew his Submission to the Bishop by petitioning or suffering.

3. He goes on to Can. LVIII. *Requiring the Surplice to be worn*; to which he gives the name of a *Symbolical Vestment*. This Word may sound great in the Ears of them that understand it not, who perhaps will wonder, when they are told, that He means only by that hard Word, a *significant Garment* signifying *Purity*. We say, we suppose Him to mean so; but really there is not the least intimation in our Canons or Rubricks, that it hath any Signification at all put upon it, or that it is any more than a *distinctive Garment*, as the Law appoints to Judges and other Officers. And if any think they may be distinguished from Tradesmen at other times, but not in the Exercise of their Function, it is as much as to say, a Judge may be distinguished by his Scarlet in the Streets, but not on the Bench. Mr. Baxter wrote to Dr. Earl (as is said in his *Life*, abridg'd by Mr. Calamy) that *He no more scrupled the Tippet on his Gown, than the Cushion on his Pulpit*, nor had He more reason for one than the other. But if it should be suppos'd to signify *Purity* or *Beauty*, we see not that this can make it unlawful, any more than were the Womens Veils, that did signify *Subje-*

tion to their Husbands, 1 Cor. 11. or indeed all the Habit of Women prescrib'd 1 Tim. 2. 9. which is to signifie Modesty and Shamefacedness.

4. The next Canon He finds fault with is **Can. LXVIII.** *That Ministers are requir'd to Baptize all Children, that are offer'd to them for that purpose.* That this doth not extend to the Children of Jews and Infidels is as certain, as that Mr. Calamy is unjust in supposing it. It is so far from requiring Him to baptize *all Children without Exception*, that He is not bound to baptize the Children of a Neighbouring Parish, much less of such as are not within the pale of the visible Church. A Minister by his Institution hath committed to him the *Care and Government of the Souls in the Church* of — And it is the Church there which is his Charge, and it is of the Children of Church-Members that the Canon speaks: Nor is there any difference herein between the practice of Conformists now, and of the Nonconformists, when they were in their places (some few excepted, who were *Independents*) Mr. Baxter tells us, *He baptiz'd all the Children in that great Town of Kederminster, taking the best Security He could get for their Education.* And though He supposeth in his *Disput. of Right to Sacraments*, that there may

may be Parents, whose Children may lose their Right to Baptism, yet when He comes to explain who they are, we believe a Minister may live sixty Years in the largest Market Town in *England*, and not have a Child offer'd to Baptism, born of two such Parents: Yea farther, when we observe the use of Circumcision in the *Jewish Church*, into which (as into an *Olive Tree*) we were grafted, and observe what Respect God manifesteth to the *Covenant of their Ancestors*, *Levit. 26. 45.* with *Rom. 11. 28.* We cannot believe that the Right of Children to Baptism, depends intirely upon the immediate Parents. But if a case should happen, wherein He judgeth it unlawful, He must humbly represent it to the Bishop; if he cannot comply nor be reliev'd, He must be suspended: How easily could we shew Mr. *Calamy* many of the Queen's Laws, which if rigorously urg'd in all cases, that we suppose, may happen, may bring him or any good Man else, in such suppos'd Circumstances, to a Necessity of Suffering?

5. The next Canon is *Can. LXXII.* which He thus repeats, *Ministers are debar'd the liberty of keeping private Fasts upon any Occasion, or so much as being present at them.* His Misrepresentation of this Canon lies in leaving out all that which should explain it.

104 A Defence of Ministerial Conformity

He first leaves out the word *solemn*, when the Canon saith, that no one shall appoint or keep *any solemn Fast*, it doth not at all intermeddle with what Persons do in their Closets or Families, according to our Lord's Injunctions. *Mat. 6. 16, 17, 18.* This seems to be granted, but He saith, that *to Fast and Pray with his People is a part of the Ministers Office, which he can no more renounce than Preaching the Gospel*; we come therefore to a greater Omission, He leaves out, that the Canon forbids Fasts, *other than such as by Law are, or by publick Authority shall be appointed.* Now the allowed times of Fasting by the Law and publick Authority do so frequently return, that there can be no possible need that a Minister should appoint any other. In the *Book of Common Prayer* there is a *Table*, the Title of which is, *Days of Fasting or Abstinence*, where out of 365 days, there are 128 allowed for Fasting, and amongst the rest *every Friday except Christmas Day.* If He now wisheth that He had chang'd the Objection, and upbraided us with our multiplicity of fasting Days, we must refer him to *Bishop Stillingfleet's Ecclesiastical Cases*, p. 389. We are not to make Objections for Him, but to answer His. And if He should say "Of what use then, is this Canon, that forbids Ministers to ap-
"point

“point Fasts, when the Law allows of so many? We answer, that it is not reasonable to suppose therefore that it can forbid fasting for the ordinary Exercise of Devotion; but must forbid the indicting Fasts for seditious Ends and Purposes, as particularly for *Exorcising of possessed Persons*, which is expressly nam'd in the Canon: that no one should attempt to *cast out Devils by Fasting and Prayer*, or hold *Solemn Fasts publickly or privately, without leave of the Bishop*, for that or other ends, which the Law or publick Authority doth not appoint.

6. The last Canon of this sort, which He mentions, is Can. CXII. wherein *Ministers are requir'd Yearly to give in the Names of the Non-Communicants in their Parishes to the Bishop*. If the Bishop should require this (whom we promise to obey) what hath Mr. Calamy to object against it? Why, He saith, if we so exhibit their Names, *they are to be Excommunicated and Confin'd to Goals till they die*: And then He goes on with the Aggravation of this Consequence. But is this the necessary Consequence of this matter? May not a Minister give an account of the State of his Parish to the Bishop, but presently the Bishop must prosecute all the Non-Communicants, and send them to Goals? May not the Minister together with the
Names

Names give to the Bishop the Character of the Persons; who keep away from Fears and Doubts, who from Scruples, who from Carelessness, and who by reason of Scandals? But then Mr. *Calamy* adds a Consequence of his Consequence, that this is to *force them to the Sacrament, and so to Profaneness and Sacrilege*: As if He did not know that Ministers were not only allowed, but bound to repel the Scandalous from the Lord's Supper, if they should offer themselves. Nevertheless if in some dangerous times any hardship should come upon a Minister in this Case, that it proves Sinful to exhibit the Names of any particular Person or Persons on this account; why then (the Reader will pardon the Repetition) we are not bound by any Promise so to do: The Oath being limited to things only *Lawful and Honest*.

And now at last (after so many Accusations) He seems to own that Ministers are not bound by the Oath of Canonical Obedience to approve of the Canons, yet, He saith, *The Case of a Minister is the same with that of a Justice of Peace, though a Justice be not bound by his Oath to approve of every Law of the Land, yet is He bound to execute all of them by his place, when He is call'd to it, so a Minister, &c.* To which we answer, that
the

the Case of a *Minister* is not the same with that of a *Justice of Peace* in the matter before us, nor any thing like it. For a *Justice of Peace* besides his Oath of Obedience to the Queen, takes an Oath to put Her Laws in Execution; this makes the Essential Difference. This Oath in Question is not like the *Justices Oath*, but like that which every Subject takes to His proper Governour. So that his instance of denouncing Excommunications, is not to his present purpose, but must be refer'd to the other place, where He himself hath set it, viz. under the next Head. Which is,

2. *Another Capital Reason why the Oath of Canonical Obedience is scrupled, viz. because the Episcopal Government is managed by Chancellors Courts, where Laymen Exercise the Church Keys by decretive Excommunications and Absolutions, &c.* In answer to this, we shall consider

1. Whether Ministers are bound by Oath to these Courts. This He insinuates, but hath nothing but Misrepresentation to prove it. The *Oath of Canonical Obedience* hath not the word *Ordinary* nor *Chief Ministers* in it; but is only to the Bishop of the Diocese therein nam'd and his Successors. Indeed the Promise at Ordination is to obey the *Ordinary*, and other *Chief Ministers*, and it is

108 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

is expressly limited (as was said before) to a following their *Godly Admonitions*, and submitting to their *Godly Judgments*. Here He saith, by *Ordinary* is meant not only the *Bishops*, but *Judges of the Courts*; and that in this Sense it is used by the *Civilians*. We believe it may, but it is evident it is not so us'd in this Promise, because it is expressly distinguished from the *other Chief Ministers*. But then at least He thinks that those *other Chief Ministers* are Laymen, *Officials*, *Commissaries*, &c. For our parts, we are willing to follow the *Godly Admonitions* even of Laymen, whether Chancellors and Officials in one Court, or Judges and Justices in another. But we see no reason to think that *Chief Ministers* signifie Laymen; when the words seem to be the plain Englishing of *Archidiaconi*; unless He thought the *Arch Deacons* to be Laymen (as He seems to do by reckoning them up with Chancellors and Officials) who are of the gravest *Presbyters* in the Diocese: And when we find not the Word us'd in any other Sense, than for *Ministers of Christ*, in the whole Book of Ordination, or of the Liturgy of which it is a part. And that, lastly, He should make this Obedience to be owing not only to Laymen, but to the very *Attendants on those Courts*, if we had not been well us'd to his way

way of Representation, had been very wonderful. But if we are not sworn to these Courts, we must consider,

2. How far we are oblig'd to submit to their determination: And here He hath Mistakes of the highest Nature, that Ministers *must act Blindfold, and not see with their own Eyes.* That *they had not so much as a Juagment of Discretion left them, &c.* If this be Misrepresentation too, than hath the whole of his Performance been all of a piece, and injustice hath strangely like a Thread run through his Discourse, though we believe, not so intended by Him. Here we hope to make it appear,

First, That no part of the Pastoral Power is taken from Ministers, that Christ hath given them. That the whole Pastoral Power is given them in Ordination is not deny'd. Mr. Corbet in his *Nonconformist's Plea for Lay-Communion.* p. 14. hath at large prov'd it, from the *publick Forms of the Church of England, &c.* and if any part of the Exercise of it had been debar'd them, this had been a Grievance, but ought not to have hindred them from doing what they could.

The silenc'd Ministers (Mr. Calamy tells us, p. 540) *were as free as any for the Oath of Allegiance,* when yet the Laws restrain'd the Exercise of their Ministry almost in all points;

110 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*
points; still they Swear to the Government, though they confess it restrains them from all Discipline by Synods, &c. yet did we never reproach them with owning that Government by Oath, which thus restrains them. But that we are restrain'd from any Exercise of that Power that Christ hath given us, He can never prove; though He insinuates as if we *consented to overthrow the Pastoral Office*. He attempts to prove it thus. *The most proper use of the Keys, saith He, is in a way of Judging who is to be admitted to Sacramental Communion, and who debar'd it.* We grant him, that this is one proper use of the Keys. And are the Conforming Ministers depriv'd of this Power? Mr. Baxter speaking of this very matter, saith, *The Ministers of the Church of England have by the Law of the Land, all Power Essential to Pastors; and gives us instances of their Power home to this Purpose. See Append. to his Life. p. 78.* He knows that the Rubrick before the Communion not only empowers, but commands us, *to keep off all Notorious Evil Livers, &c. not suffering them to come.* To this He objects, that the Minister *must in fourteen Days give notice to the Ordinary of any one that He so debars.* One would wonder where the Evil of this should lye; would He have the Ministers unaccountable in a
Matter

Matter of this Nature? How often hath *Bishop Usber's Reduction* been recommended as a sufficient ground of Union, desired at the Savoy, &c.? Now the first Proposition is, *That the Minister should present to the Monthly Synod, those that are debar'd from the Lord's Table.* As Mr. Calamy sets it down. p. 151. The Independants indeed have no Jurisdiction without their particular Congregations, therefore they join the People in the Government with their Ministers. Who can think it desirable, that one Minister lyable to many Infirmities, should be left sole Judge in a matter of this Importance? If He thinks Himself fit for such a Work, we do not. He would be loth to be disseiz'd of his House and Lands, by the meer Power of one Justice of Peace, but would desire a fair Tryal by a Jury: And surely Church Communion is a higher Possession than Lands and Tenements. To this He saith, *The Cognizance of Matters of this Nature—is more proper for those that have the Opportunity of personal Inspection, than for meer Strangers.* By those that have the Opportunity of Personal Inspection, He must either mean the People or the Ministers. We all own the People have no part in the Government: As for the Ministers, they are suppos'd already to have adjudg'd the matter

112 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*
ter by suspending or debarring the Criminal. If the Person suspended humbly yields and submits, we conceive, there is ordinarily, no other process needful, the end is obtain'd. If the Person denies the Fact or is Obstinate, we crave leave to dissent from Mr. Calamy, *The Cognizance is not so fit for Neighbours as for Strangers.* Their *Opportunity of Personal Inspection* qualifies them more to be *Witnesses*, not to be *Judges*. They are ordinarily too much *Parties*, especially in Contentions, wherein (as in the Apostles times) *some are puffed up*, and by reason of Interest, Relation, Acquaintance, Dependance, are easily prejudiced either for or against the Accused Person. Whosoever reads Mr. Rutherford of *the Power of the Keys*, will find this abundantly explain'd and prov'd. But saith Mr. Calamy, *The Appeal in such a Case would be more properly lodg'd in a Synod—than with a Set of wrangling Lawyers.* We answer, The Appeal is to be lodg'd with the Bishop, who either remits the matter to the Pastor of the place, in case it be easily determin'd, and He be found not to be a Party; or else doth commissionate others to enquire into it. Ay, but saith Mr. Calamy *it is uncertain whether the Ordinaries*, to whom the Appeal is to be made, *are meer Laymen, or Presbyters, or Diocesans;*

ocesans; The Answer is plain, They are the Bishops, who are alone call'd by that Name in our Church Books, though the Civilians may give the Name to others. Then as to the *Tediousness*, *Vexatiousness*, and *Expensiveness* of this Procedure, which He complains of; it is more or less, according to the Prudence of the Minister, Obstinacy of the Party, Notoriety or Obscurity of the Fact, or the like, and is more or less incident to all Trials, according as these or other like Circumstances vary. We see not therefore where any part of the Power of the Keys is taken from us, unless He would have us own the Independency of Churches, and that every single Congregation hath the full Power of Government in it self, which the Presbyterians, as well as Episcopal do utterly deny.

Secondly, We are farther to make it appear, that Ministers are not bound *blindly to follow the Determination of the Courts*; not in any thing, especially not in the weighty matters of *Excommunications and Absolutions*. We do not say, that there have not been great Faults committed in these matters: God forbid, that we should speak a word in the Defence of them. But the Faults were Personal, and we had no hand in them any way. To make things plain, and to

114 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

free them from Disguise; *Excommunication* signifies divers things, or there are several parts thereof, to all which the Name is apply'd. There is, 1. *Authoritative Excommunication*, which belongs to Christ, who hath all Power in Heaven and Earth. 2. *Decretive* or judicial *Excommunication*, which is, when upon a fair Tryal, the Person is found guilty, adjudg'd Contumacious, &c. 3. *Declarative Excommunication*, called *binding on Earth*, when it is denounc'd and declar'd cum effectu. 4. *Executive Excommunication*, when the People do withdraw from the Criminal, keep no Company with him, no not so much as to eat with him. Our Concern lies not with the first and last, but with the two middle parts, the *decretive* and the *declarative* Excommunications. The one of them is founded on the *Law of Nature* and Reason, that a Criminal should have a fair Tryal Face to Face; the other is founded on the *Law of Christ*, who hath given Power to his Ministers, to declare and pronounce in his Name, according to his *Word*, as to matter of Right, and according to the decree aforesaid, as to matter of Fact. In lesser matters (as was hinted before) the Bishop, either determines a matter himself, remits it to the Minister, or commissionates Neighbour Ministers: but if the matter be weighty

weighty and yet doubtful, and the Party Obstinate, there is a Necessity of a Legal Tryal, upon Oaths of Witnesses, in the presence of the Offender: This is done in the *Ecclesiastical Courts*; They are in this Case as *Juries* are by Common Law, between the King and Subjects, or between Man and Man. The Minister (if He pleaseth) may be present, and is an Assessor on the Bench. If He finds fault with this, that this Court consists of *Laymen and wrangling Lawyers*; let him leave out the invidious Term *Wrangling* and it is confest. And why may not *Laymen*, who understand the Law, and are under Oath to do Justice, try a plain matter of Fact? We grant these Courts are lyable to many Corruptions, and so are all other Courts and Tryals whatsoever. If upon the Tryal the Crime be prov'd, or the Party Contumacious, an *Excommunication* is decreed: If the Minister be also satisfi'd, He as an Officer of Christ, by vertue of the Power receiv'd at Ordination — *Whose soever Sins thou retainest, they are retained*, doth denounce and declare the *Excommunication* before the Church: nor is there any *Excommunication with Effect* till this be done. Perhaps Mr. Calamy may say. "Thus far it may be well enough; but what if the Minister be not satisfied: what if the Parties be such

116 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

“as were never suspended or accused by
 “Him, but by Promoters: And this for
 “meer Trifles, yea for Scruples of Consci-
 “ence, as in some late Reigns? Must Mi-
 nisters be *Instruments in worrying* (as He ex-
 presseth it) *as Religious Persons, perhaps, as any*
in their Parishes? Must a Minister denounce
 by solemn Sentence a Person Excommuni-
 cate, whom He thinks in his Conscience not
 Guilty, only because the Court hath decreed
 it? (and *vice versa* as to Absolutions) we
 answer plainly. This is no more than what
 the Highest Judges continually do. They
 must in their pronouncing Sentence, follow
 the Verdict of the Jury one way or other;
 often when their own Opinion is declar’d on
 the other side. How far these Honourable
 Persons do well or ill herein, is not our busi-
 ness to enquire, we do not censure them.
 However we humbly conceive with Sub-
 mission to better Judgments, A Minister
 of Christ ought not to act so. Sure we are
 we have never bound our selves so to do.
 For though the *Allegata & Probata* are still
 to be minded in all Judgments, yet if it be
 apparent to the Minister, that the Person is
 wrong’d by the decreed Excommunication,
 we are of Opinion, till otherwise informed,
 He ought not to put forth the Power inhe-
 rent in him by his Office to *declare and de-*

to the Church of England. 117

nounce it. If therefore He be put upon it, He must appeal to the Bishop, and petition his Authority: If the Bishop cannot or will not help him, He must patiently suffer the Penalty that the Law lays upon him for refusal. Blessed be God, a Minister at this day, that carries it with Prudence and Humility, is in no great danger: But no Constitution can be so perfect in which Conscientious Persons may not some time or other be expos'd to Sufferings.

Thus we have gone through the whole of what we intended and propounded. And as we laid aside the consideration of Reordination in the beginning, so we do now of the *Declaration against taking up Arms, and Renouncing the Covenant*: Both which are taken away by Law. Only we commend to Mr. Calamy's Perusal (to shew him his Misrepresentation of those things too) Mr. Corbet's *Enquiry into the Oxford Oath*. 4^o. In *his Remains* so often quoted by Himself in other parts of it. And by the way in Mr. Corbet's *Enquiry*, we find four Rules set down, not much unlike those, which we set down in the beginning of this *Defence*. Now if Mr. Calamy knew of these Rules of Equity and Charity, how comes it to pass, that He hath always taken things by the worst Handle, and still put the worst (in-

118 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

stead of the best) Interpretation upon them, that the Words could be suppos'd to bear? Is not the Law of Charity the Law of Christ? Have we been the Persons that have accus'd the [Ejected Ministers? We have honoured them, pleaded their Cause against their Opposers; why must we now be treated so unkindly as to have our most solemn Actings Represented in such strange Colours; yea, to have the most stiff Men prefer'd before us, as dealing more Honestly, because they gave him more occasion to expose our Conformity to the People.

Mr. Baxter in one of his last Books, call'd *His Confession and Vindication*, saith, p. 27. that when He wrote against the *Laudian Faction*, calling themselves the *Church of England*, He did indeed distinguish them from others, whom He calls, *The Old-Church of England*; yet, adds He, *I did not so largely open the Difference, as I ought, which gave Mr. Lobb occasion to write confidently for Separation.* May we not now say, that this fault which Mr. Baxter bewail'd, gave Mr. Calamy also occasion to write as He hath done; presuming perhaps, that He was only doing the part of an *Historian*, to copy out what his Author had said against his Adversaries? He ought then to make the same Confession that Mr. Baxter did before him, and to have

a care of the same Fault in all his Words and Writings for the time to come. Yet, let not the Enemies triumph over us for our Divisions : it is apparent by the whole of what is said on either side, that the matters we differ in are of small Consequence in comparison of the things wherein we are agreed : And even in these things wherein we differ, it proceeds from different Apprehensions and Notions (which are as various as the Lineaments in Mens Faces) while yet we own the Necessity of *forbearing one another in Love*. If the Nonconformists had the same *latitude* of Interpretation of the matters in dispute, and the same Notions that we have of them, they would do as we have done; and if we had fallen into the same *Straitness* of Notion and Interpretation that they fell into, we must have done as they. Which Notions and Interpretations are most agreeable to Justice and Charity, the Reader must be left to judge. Some will say, there be other Objections against the Liturgy, &c. besides these mention'd by Mr. Calamy; suppose there be, we have done what we undertook (as God hath enabled us) and the other things may receive light from our Answer to his general Misrepresentations. Mr. Calamy hath these Words in his *Preface*, where He is speaking of *this*

120 *A Defence of Ministerial Conformity*

Chapter, which we have gone through so far as the *Defence* of our selves is concern'd: *Upon the whole*, saith He, *I may venture to say, that He that will take the pains to peruse that Chapter, may in one view, take in the whole Cause in debate, and see the Strength of the Argument*—We have taken that pains; and we hope He will not find that we have omitted one thing (in what we undertook) in which we conceived any Strength to lye. We only desire that if He is pleased to reply that He would deal as fairly with us. And the Lord direct us into all necessary Truth.

Adden-

Addenda

To Pag. 44. line 14.

THere is an Objection that we thought not of, till the *Defence* was near Printed, the Answer to which we here insert, lest the Omission should prove a handle to any to continue their Censures of us. When Mr. Calamy objected against the *Sign of the Cross* as made necessary to *Church Communion*, because, (saith He) *wherever it is refus'd, Baptism is to be deny'd*; we refer'd Him to the *Office of Private Baptism*, wherein the use of that Sign is not requir'd. But perhaps, Mr. Calamy will say, *what is this to the Baptism of those of Riper Years? The Form of Private Baptism concerns only Infants, as appears by the Office thro'out: But in the Baptism of those of Riper Years, it is always requir'd that this Ceremony be us'd. And is not this a consenting to alter the Terms of Christ's Covenant and Sacrament, if we consent to reject those from Baptism who are made Disciples, because they scruple and refuse the Sign of the Cross?* To this we answer, no such matter. There is no *Rubrick* prescribing, or *Order* enjoining one of *Riper Years* that desires to be baptized, that He should beforehand be obliged to profess his Submission

Addenda.

mission to this Ceremony; nor is the Minister to enquire about his willingness or unwillingness so to do; nor doth any *Rubrick* or *Order* forbid the baptizing any Person, unless He will first promise to submit to this Sign. And if there be no such *Rubricks* or *Orders*, then do we not *Assent* or *Consent* to any such. On the contrary, when any Person of *Riper Years* desires to be baptized, if He be found sufficiently instructed, and is judg'd duely prepared for this Holy Sacrament, and at the time of the *Administration* doth answer to the usual *Interrogatories*, concerning the *Christian Covenant*, set down in the *Office*, then must the Minister proceed to baptize him: The Order for signing him with the *Sign of the Cross* is not till the Baptism is finish'd, and fully compleat, and so declared. And if when the Baptism is finished, the baptized Person shall by reason of his *Scruples*, refuse to be afterwards sign'd with the *Sign of the Cross*, the Minister cannot help it, but must proceed to the following Declaration concerning his being *Regenerate and grafted into the Body of Christ's Church*, and to the owning and praying for Him as such, *that* being declar'd by the *Canon* to depend on his *Baptism* alone, without any relation to this *Sign*. *But what if the Person*
(may

Addenda.

(may Mr Calamy say) should declare beforehand, that He will not submit to this Sign, and yet notwithstanding desires Baptism, may we in such a case baptize him? We answer plainly, we doubt not but we may, and ought to do it. There being nothing else required beforehand as the condition of his Baptism, but that he be duly qualifi'd, and make the Answers as is before mentioned. Then when He is baptized, the most that the Minister can be suppos'd to do, is to offer to use that Ceremony: and if the baptized refuse it, the Minister is no farther concern'd, nor hath any more to do about it; but is to go on with the Office as is aforesaid. It may be thought by some an Act of Disobedience in the Baptized Person to refuse an innocent Order of the Church: But we see not that any one can blame the Minister, who was bound to baptize him, and observ'd all things pre-requisite thereunto.

To Pag. 68 line 17 after &c.

To this agreeth the Form of the Burial of the Dead at Sea, as it is set down in the close of the Liturgy, in these Words, viz. We commit his Body to the Deep, to be turned into Corruption, looking for the Resurrection of the Body (when the Sea shall give up her Dead) and the Life of the World to come, &c.

A Post.

POSTSCRIPT

Concerning *Reordination.*

THE Design of the foregoing Discourse being only to vindicate the *present Terms of Conformity*, in which we are now concern'd; we omitted the Case of *Reordination*, and only refer'd to Mr. *Humphrey's* Book on that Subject. But for the sake of others, who may be likewise concern'd in this matter, and yet perhaps have not had many thoughts about it, we shall here consider what may be said in Defence of that also, chiefly on the grounds which Mr. *Humphrey* hath laid down.

We shall not enter into the Dispute about the Validity of Presbyterian Ordination without a Bishop; nor argue whether the want of *Jurisdiction* makes any difference between Ordination perform'd by *unassociated Presbyters*, and that which is celebrated by *Classes* and *Synods*; but because they

with

with whom our present Debate doth lye, maintain the Validity of the *Ordination* they have receiv'd. And it is not likely that they will depart from it, we shall therefore in like manner suppose it too, and shall go now upon that Supposition.

We shall endeavour to prove the lawfulness of *Reordination* in the present case, from *Scripture-practice*, and from the *Nature and Reason of the thing*.

1. We shall prove the Lawfulness of *Reordination* from *Scripture practice*. The *Apostles* had all a double mission or *Ordination*, and both extraordinary by Christ Himself: They had *first* a call to the Office of the Apostleship, and *one* authoritative Mission to the *lost Sheep of the House of Israel*. *Mat.* 10. 7. and they had *another* likewise, which extended to *all Nations*, and so to the use of that Office in a farther place. *Mat.* 28. 19. So the Power of binding and loosing was committed to them at divers times. *Mat.* 18. 18. with *John* 20. 21, 22. Thus St. Paul had a *Mission Potestative* from Christ Himself, to go Preach the Gospel to the Gentiles at large or in general, as well as to the *Jews*, *Acts* 26. 16, 17, 18. *Gal.* 1. 11, 12. And He was afterwards confirm'd in his Calling to the same Ministry by *Ananias*. *Acts* 22. 14, 15. And yet he had
also

also afterwards another *Ordination* from Men, by command of the *Holy Ghost*, by the hands of *Lucius* and *Niger* and *Manaen*, who were *Teachers and Prophets* at *Antioch*. *Acts* 13. 1, 2, 3. Here was a double Ordination, one extraordinary by Christ Himself immediately, and the other ordinary by the hands of Men (though by his Order) after he was publicly own'd and confirm'd in the former by *Ananias*. St. *Barnabas* had a *Mission* first from the *Church of Jerusalem*, when He went to *Antioch* to Preach the Gospel there, and in his way thither. *Acts* 11. 22. and yet He had another afterwards together with St. *Paul* by the same hands. *Acts* 13. 1, 2, 3. they being called then to the work of the Ministry in *Seleucia* and *Cyprus*; By which it appears, that if a Minister for special and urgent Reasons have a new and special call, it is lawful for him to have a new Ordination to the same.

And one would think that the hands of a Grave Bishop, and other Good Men laid on him afresh, with Fasting and solemn Prayers for God's blessing upon Him, were likely to do him no harm. 'Tis plain from the former instances, that a Man who is a Minister already, may be ordained again; and that it is not necessary for a Man to be ordained only once to this end, to have the

Office

Office confer'd upon him. There was, as we have seen, the *Office of the Apostleship* confer'd upon the *Apostles*, and the use of that *Office* again in a farther place. And *St. Paul* we see, had a full *Commission* at the first for *all places*, and yet being afterwards sent upon special Service, He had another more Special likewise. Thus some that are Ministers already, may be afterwards called or sent by another Mission to a farther place or Service. And besides his first Ordination to set him apart for his Office, there may be one more particular to *recommend Him to the Grace of God*, for his work in another place; and if so, why not two for the continuance of his Ministry, for the *parrhesia*, or full Liberty thereof in the same? in the *Heads of Agreement* assented to by the *United Ministers*, A. D. 1691. Sect. 2. Art. 6. it is said; *That whereas such Ordination is only intended for such as never before had been Ordained to the Ministerial Office; if any Judge that in the Case also of the Removal of one formerly Ordained to a New Station or Pastoral Charge, there ought to be a like solemn recommending him and his Labours to the Grace and Blessing of God; no different Sentiments and Practices herein shall be any Occasion of Contention or breach of Communion with us.*

2, *From the Nature and Reason of the thing.*

For

For to consider the *Nature* of the Ministerial Call or Ordination, would be the way to put this matter very much out of doubt. *The Call* to the Ministry is *from Christ*, which He gives by conferring an *Ability* for it, and an *Inclination* thereunto. *Ordination* is the Investiture into this Office *before Men*, by a Declaration or publick approving a Man to be a Minister, or is a solemn Allowance of his preceding Call; and is a Rite to give a Man the Current Repute or Valuation of a Minister, and an Authority to exercise the Function with freedom and acceptance in the Church of God. It is a *Confirmation* of a Man's *Call from Christ* to the Ministry (which is his *Commission coram Deo*) by the solemn *God speed* or *Approbation* of such, who are in Authority, to give a Man the Reputation and Power of a Minister *coram hominibus*, to its due intents, in the Church where He is sent. It is *Christ* that hath appointed such an Office to be, furnisheth a Man with Endowments for it, and giveth him a Will so that He dedicates Himself to the Work. *Rom. 12. 6, 7, 8. 1 Cor. 12. 4, 7. Acts 20. 28.* and for the tryal hereof the Question is put, *do you think that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost, to take upon you this Office and Ministration? And do you think in your Heart, that you are called accord-*
ing

ing to the Will of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c?
 And what then doth *Man* do, but upon try-
 al, finding this to be so, He authoritatively
 Approveth and *Declareth* him to be a Mini-
 ster, and to have *Christ's* Commission for
 the work of the Ministry by the solemnity
 of *Ordination*, and so adds to Him an Autho-
 rity for the exercise of this Function *towards*
Man, which he had not before? This is
 necessary for the preserving of Order among
 Men, and to prevent the intrusion of incom-
 petent and unqualifi'd Persons into the Of-
 fice, and to give an esteem in regard of Men,
 many of whom will not, and others for cer-
 tain Reasons cannot hold one for a true and
 legal Minister otherwise. *Ordinatio*, faith
Amesius, *nihil aliud est quam solennis declara-*
tio, ut Coronatio Regis & inauguratio Magi-
stratus. De Conf. li. 4. ch. 25. *Est solennis*
quedam introductio Ministri in ipsius functionis
liberam functionem. Medul. Theol. lib. 1. ch.
 39. An adjunct consequent to his call from
 Christ, to make it current amongst Men.
Est persone introductio quâ publicis precibus
præmissis Ecclesie commendatur, etque vocatio
impositis manibus confirmatur. Wolleb. It
 declareth him before Men, and giveth Him
 Authority for the exercise of the Ministry
 among them, and commits Him to the
 Grace of God for the discharge thereof.

Now if this be the Case and *Nature* of the thing, what should hinder but there may be a double or treble *Approbation*, *Declaration*, or *Confirmation* of the same Ministry, if there be just occasion for it?

As for the *Reason* of it, let it be further considered, that it is a Right belonging to, and a Duty incumbent on every national Church, to take great care about the Persons, to whom it shall intrust the Administration of Holy things, and commit the care of Souls. And in Consequence hereof it must be likewise allowed, that it should be left to its Judgment and Determination what Persons to make choice of, who are in proper Office for it, who should be intrusted with the Admission of such Persons, and in what Order, and with what Solemnity it should be done, which is not contrary to Gods Holy Word. This in some other Reformed Churches where there are no Bishops, is committed to *Presbyters only*, but in the Church of *England* is committed to *the Bishops*, together with certain *Assisting Presbyters*; and the manner in which it is required to be done, is by solemn Ordination with Fasting and Prayer, and laying on of hands, and giving Authority to Preach the Word, and to administer the Sacraments and Discipline. This way she hath concluded upon, as judging

ing it most conformable to the Primitive Practice, without censuring her Sister Churches in other Nations, whom she leaves to chuse for themselves, and it is reasonable that they should leave her to chuse for herself. And this way being thus concluded and determined, it is thought fit and reasonable, that all who are to be admitted to Holy Ministrations in it, should submit to it. And if they who were admitted by *Presbyters only*, think the *Ordination* received from them sufficient; suppose, that possibly it might be so, namely, that they had a due *Examination* of their Ability and Inclination, and an *Approbation* thereupon, with proper Solemnity; yet because this *Examination* and *Approbation* was not by such Officers as were appointed by the national Church, it doth not therefore *appear to it*, that they had so due a Mission, as *it* doth desire and hath settled. Therefore though the former Ordination be possibly good, yet it not being done by such Persons to whom the Care of this matter is committed by the Church of *England*, it is resolved it should be done again, to make a Man to be receiv'd as a Minister in the Church of Christ, with the more unexceptionable Authority.

This now helps to answer the great Objection about the *Renouncing or Nullifying*

the former Ordination hereby, as illegal and insufficient in it self: which is only to stretch the matter by a severe Interpretation, when there is no such thing requir'd of them, nor can any such Interpretation in the meer Construction of the thing it self, be necessarily infer'd from such a practice. The most that can be concluded from such a *Reordination* being only this, that the Legality and Sufficiency of their former Ordination *doth not appear* to the national Church; and therefore it is resolv'd that there should be a new Mission, to declare and give Authority for the Execution of the said Office, in such a manner as should not be lyable to any farther doubt or dispute. And we have this as the judgment of *Calvin*, *that every Church hath liberty to ordain and appoint such an Order or Form of Government, as is most apt and profitable for it, because the Lord hath prescrib'd no certainty therein, on 1 Cor. 11. 2.* And this beforementioned being the particular Order and Government pitch't upon by the *Church of England*, why should it not be submitted to?

As to what Mr. *Calamy* adds touching the formal *Renunciation* of the foregoing Ordination by Presbyters, requir'd in the Diocese of *Chester*, which He thinks *puts the matter beyond all Dispute*: We think that it is
beyond

beyond all dispute, that He doth abundantly overlash in his Conclusion from it, supposing the matter of Fact to be true, which we depend upon Mr. *Calamy's* Authority for. This is in persuance of the same rigid Notion and Interpretation of things, which He took from his Dr. *Swadling*, which we had occasion to mention towards the beginning of the foregoing Discourse, to make the *extralegal* and particular Sentiments and practices of some Men to be a Rule to our Judgments. What if one Bishop or one Doctor be thus severe in his Notion or practice, are all others bound to judge by this Rule? What if one Nonconformist condemns every thing almost in the Established Church, yet may not others have diversity of Sentiments about many of the same things, as He Himself saith, in the beginning of this Chapter? But 'tis reasonable to believe, He saith, *that this one Bishop had not a different Sense from the rest, though He acted more openly, while others were more upon the Reserve.* But this is more than He knows, and therefore it was not *reasonable* for him to have said so. And yet if it was so, it was surely a superfining upon the Law, and to require any such thing of any Person, who had before been ordained by Presbyters when He came for Episcopal Ordination, was without doubt

an illegal Imposition, and might justly have been refused to have been submitted to. Yet on the other side we do not indeed believe, that the Reordination was intended as a *Recognition of their former Ordination* neither, as Mr. Calamy saith, some would have had it call'd. That would be to go too far on the other side, and to say more than there is any ground for. It may be indeed a *Recognition*, or a new Declaration of their *Call from Christ*, as was said before, but not of their former *Ordination from Man*; for that had been to suppose their former good to all intents and purposes. But why might it not yet be a *new investiture* on the grounds before-mentioned, without so much as a *virtual Renunciation* of what they had before.

Well, but the same Form, Mr. Calamy saith, must be used in their Case, as if they were then to be first entred into the Ministry without the least variation, and if they were owned for Ministers before, why should they be ordained in the same manner, as if they were no Ministers? We answer, if they were Ministers, yet being not admitted into the Ministry according to the Order and Rule settled in this Church, and by the Persons appointed by it to that end, whilst yet they were within the limits of it, it is no strange thing if the Church

be dissatisfi'd about their being such; and therefore they are required to submit to the form of Admission that is settled by it. But, saith Mr. Calamy, *this doth contradict the profess'd Principles of those in the Church, that declare the being twice ordained flatly unwarrantable; from which it will follow, that they suppose that they were not ordain'd before.* To be ordain'd a second time when the Church wherein they live hath no Scruple about the Validity of their former Ordination, and no other urgent Reasons given for it, would indeed be perfectly needless; but here it *doth not appear* to the Church, that they were sufficiently ordain'd before (though possibly they might be so) because they were not ordained by those Officers whom the Church hath thought fit to intrust this matter with, nor yet by those of the same Kind. But suppose the worst, that those of the Church should condemn their former Ordination by Presbyters only as no Ordination, only for that Reason and no other, yet this being not declared in Law, must those that have the former Ordination by Presbyters needs condemn it likewise? If they take the former Ordination as *not appearing* sufficient to this Church (in their Circumstances) and therefore submit to a new one in it, this is as much as in the Con-

struction of the thing they are reasonably bound to judge, the Law having made no determination in the matter.

But now here is another Charge of a very considerable nature that Mr. Calamy doth load this Practice with; that *this is to pour contempt upon the Reformed Churches abroad, by disowning them and their Ministers, who had no other Ordination than such as that which those who have here been ordain'd by Presbyters only, have receiv'd.* But this is a charge without ground; the Church of England taketh the liberty only to pursue her own Judgment in this matter within her own limits, and leaveth others to take their own measures in theirs: This is the Order and Constitution which she hath settled, that Ordination to Church Offices should be intrusted chiefly in the hands of the Bishops, to whom the chief Jurisdiction in Ecclesiastical Affairs is committed. And this Order and Constitution being once settled, and there being no just Exception against the lawfulness of it, why should not they, who expect to be admitted to Church Offices in it (if the same be required) comply therewith? But yet to shew her moderation in this matter, it is well known, that (before an Act of the State bound up her hands) she hath on occasion admitted those who have come from
the

the Foreign Churches, who have only had Ordination by Presbyters there, where there have not been Bishops, to the Sacred Offices here, without requiring this Compliance from them, as appears particularly by an Authentick determination of the Question with respect to some *Scottish* Presbyters, in *Archbishop Bancroft's* days. Nor doth the Reordaining of them, who enter into the legal Privileges of the Church of *England* now, shew any change of Judgment in the Church since that *Archbishop's* days: that proceeding from an Injunction in a *Statute-Law* since, requiring all to be Episcopally Ordain'd who administer the Lord's Supper in the Church of *England* under a great Penalty, which the Bishops cannot ease them of, though they should be never so much perswaded of the Validity of their former Ordination. Still the Church of *England* owns the Reformed Churches abroad as Sister Churches, and the *Addresses* of several *Convocations* to the Late King, of *Blessed Memory* do so, and speak of their *Interests as dear to them*. But if the Church do not exercise the same Moderation to those, who within her own Limits have broken in upon her Order, this need not seem strange; because such a Violation of her Order carries

ries in it a Contempt that cannot be charged upon others.

But now there is another thing that Mr. Calamy insinuates *that this is to play with Holy things in pretending to be moved by the Holy Ghost, to take upon them the Office of a Deacon, when they know themselves already fix'd sufficiently in the highest Office of Presbyters.* We answer, that seeing it doth not sufficiently appear to the Church (though it may to themselves) that they are rightly fix'd in the Office of a *Presbyter* or *Deacon* either, but that Doubts and Scruples be moved in the Church about it. If then, there be other valid Reasons, namely, the *satisfying the Doubts* of their Fathers and Brethren, who cannot judge of what is done against the Establish'd Order to be rightly done; the having a more uncontested and *unexceptionable Liberty* of their Ministry before the World, and before their People, many of whom might otherwise scruple the Validity of their Actings; and the *studying Peace, Unity and Order* in the Church; if, we say, these and such like are thought *sufficient Reasons* to repeat the Ordination (for we find by Scripture Instances that *for some valid Reasons* it may be done) we see not but they may think themselves *mov'd by the Holy Ghost*, to take the Office of a *Deacon*, which

is *gradus ad Ministerium*, 1 Tim. 3. 13. in order to their being made *Presbyters*.

But it is objected, that the Words of the *Book of Ordination* are, that the Person is *now* called to the Office of a Priesthood, and that the Office is *now* committed to him. By which it appears to the Objecters, that *Ordination being an entrance into the Ministry, a Man cannot have a double entrance into the same State.*

Ans. He that might be in the Office before, is *now again* invested in it for new Emergent Reasons. It is true the words *now again* cannot be suppos'd to be exprest in the *Form*, which is primarily intended for them who were not ordained before: But if a Man knoweth or judgeth Himself to have had the Office formerly committed to Him, then it is *now again* to Him, and must be so understood. And if He hath the Ministry *now again* committed to him, for new and sufficient *Reasons* mention'd before, and according to the *Examples* before set down, what Evil is there in it, more than in a double *Institution* to a Pastoral Charge, or confirming with a new, a former Title to a Living? it is a second Ordination *ad corroborandum* to strengthen the former, and put it out of dispute. Why may not the *Oath of Allegiance* be repeated for the farther Confirmation

mation of what is engaged ; and yet *God's Name not taken in vain* by it ? We are nowhere obliged in Scripture to *one only Ordination* ; the instances are shewn to go the other way ; and *where there is no Law* to prohibit more, where lyeth *the Transgression*, if more be admitted upon just occasion ? And if the Reasons be good and sufficient for it, it is no *solacism*, to have a *double entrance* or investiture into the same State ; as many were entred into the conjugal State by *Ministers*, after they had been Married by *Magistrates*, that it might appear the more unexceptionable to all, though they themselves might have no doubt of the Validity of the first.

There is an Objection from the *Apostles Canons* (as they are call'd) which is hardly worth the mentioning, Can. 67. *Si quis Episcopus, aut Presbyter aut Diaconus secundum ab aliquo ordinationem susceperit, Deponitor tam ipse, quam qui ipsum ordinavit.* For though there may be reason for that *sometimes*, which is not *ordinarily* to be practised, yet our plain Answer is, that those *Canons* are owned to be *Apocryphal*, of much later Date than they would seem by their Title, and of little account even with those that we are now discoursing with. We could produce an instance from Antiquity on the
other

other side. *Colythus quidam in Ecclesiâ Alexandrinâ Presbyter alios Presbyteros ordinare presumpserat. Sed quid illis factum postea? Rescissa est hac ejus ordinatio, & omnes ab eo constituti Presbyteri in laicorum ordinem redacti fuerunt. Athanas. Apol. 2. referente Daven. Determ. 42.* In the case therefore before us, if there be no Scripture prohibition, nor any incongruity in the nature of the thing, a new and weighty Reason for a thing will supersede an old humane Authority against it.

And whereas Objections are raised from the words used at the time of laying on of hands, *Receive thou the Holy Ghost, &c.* that a being twice ordain'd, is a taking the Name of God in vain, and a kind of offering indignity to the Grace of God, as if that already confer'd were not sufficient. We take that Phrase sometimes scrupled upon other Accounts, *Receive thou the Holy Ghost*, to be a precatory Form, or Episcopal Benediction, whereby the Bishop prays for the ordained after this manner, *The Lord give Thee the Holy Ghost; The Lord pour out the Gifts and Graces of the Holy Ghost upon Thee, for the Office and Work, &c.* but, saith Mr. Calamy, it is a taking God's Name in Vain, to pray solemnly to him, for what they are assur'd they have already. On the other side, we think there can

can be no Scruple, but that we may pray for more Grace still from God, and for his continual Assistance and Blessing. More Talents and farther Aids may be requested and afresh sought.

The other Form, *take thou Authority*, &c. is yet less subject to scruple, it being plainly an appointment to *the exercise* of the Office receiv'd, in the place to which he shall be called. Yet it appears by what has been said, that *an Authority*, or Commission to the Office it self, may be renewed, or anew declar'd and confirm'd by another solemn investing Rite, for the sake of those who doubt of the sufficiency and validity of the former, and to render his Ministrations in his Office the more unquestionable.

The Church of Rome indeed making Orders a Sacrament, and to imprint an *indelible Character*, do tell us, that *as Baptism is a Sacrament of initiation into Christianity, so is Ordination into the Ministry, and thereupon, we may be as well Rebaptiz'd as those ordain'd already be reordain'd.* To which purpose is quoted a saying of St. Gregory, *Sicut Baptizatus semel, iterum baptizari non debet; ita qui consecratus est semel, in eodem iterum ordine non debet consecrari.* To which may be reply'd in the Words of Chemnitius (*Exam. de Charact.*) *Quod Baptismus non sit iterandus*
de

de re magnâ agitur, Pactum Gratiæ in illo Deus nobiscum misit. Illud verò (saith He blaming the Trent-determination) quod Baptismi proprium est, ut scilicet non iteretur, ad suos ordines transtulerunt. Thus Dr. Baldwin Professor at Wertingberg. De cas. Conscien. si quis existimet se tranquillius suo in nostris Ecclesiis officio perfungi posse, si etiam nostris Ritibus ad sacro sanctum munus utatur, nihil obstat quin Ordinationem à nostris accipere possit. Non enim eadem est ratio Reordinationis quæ Baptismi, qui iterari non potest. Hic enim sacramentum est Ecclesiæ, illa autem externus tantum Ritus. Lib. 4. Cap. 6. Cas. 6. And yet as to Baptism it self, though He to whom it hath been Administred should be persuaded in Himself, that it hath been rightfully and Canonically done, if notwithstanding there should be matter of Scruple to the National Church, of which He is, or would be a Member, concerning the legality of the Administration of it, through some suppos'd defect in the former manner of the Administration; it may be considered whether a peaceable Christian for the satisfaction of others, and for a more quiet and indisputable Enjoyment of Christian Communion with them, might not submit rather to the Administration again, than by an obstinate Stiffness in maintaining the Validity of what

He

He hath already receiv'd, break the Peace of the Church, and deprive himself of the Benefit of such Communion. Mr. Baxter in his *Directory*, Tom. 3. Qu. 46. mentions several occasions of *Rebaptizing*, the last of which only suits our case, which is, *If the Church, or the Person himself have any just cause of doubting, whether He was truly baptized or not; to do it again with Hypothetical Expressions [if thou art not baptized, I baptize thee] yea, or simply while that is understood, is lawful and fit: and it is not to be twice baptized morally, but only physically.* There follows a large Discourse to prove that the Persons mention'd, *Act. 19.* were rebaptiz'd; and having cited Mr. Baxter, we shall give the Reader that desires information in this matter another quotation from Him; both because of the Authority that his name ought to carry with it in this case with Mr. Calamy, who pretends to be his *Abridger*, and because of the fulness and clearness of his reasoning in Confirming what we have said. It is in his *Directory* Tom. 3. Qu. 21. in which He distinguisheth between *entire true Ordination*, and the *external Acts, Words, or Ceremony only*. And determines thus; that though for many Reasons there set down, Reordination *morally*, and properly so call'd is judg'd unlawful; yet,

yet, Yaith He, He that was truly ordain'd before may in some cases receive again the Repetition of the bare Words and outward Ceremonies of Ordination, &c. He mentions those cases, and amongst the rest this, in case that some real or suppos'd integral (though not essential) part was omitted, or is by the Church or Magistrate suppos'd to be omitted: and they will not permit or receive the Minister to exercise his Office unless He repeat the whole: *Watch* again, and make up that defect. And his Reasons for this determination illustrate and strengthen what we have said, viz. that Ordination signifies a moral Action and not a physical only; it essentially includes a designation to the Sacred Office, by a kind of Covenant between the dedicated Person and Christ. And the external Words are but a part only as significant of the Action of the Mind. Now the oft expressing the same mental dedication doth not make it to be as many distinct Dedications. He instanceth in the case of St. Peter, it was not a threefold Ordination which Christ used when he said thrice to him, Feed my Lambs and Sheep: And if thrice saying it that hour make it not three Ordinations, neither will thrice saying it, at many Hours, Days or Months or Years distance, in some Cases. For the time maketh not the Ordinations to be many; it is but one moral Action. But the common Error

arise from the custom of calling the outward Action alone by the name of the whole moral Action. He illustrates this thus; if you should in witness bearing be put to your Oath, and the Magistrate that was absent should say [Reach him the Book again, I did not hear him swear] The doing it twice is not morally two Witnessings or Oaths, but one only twice physically utter'd. We can trust the Reader to apply this.

In the foregoing Discourse, we endeavour'd to clear up our own Practice in meer Self-defence. This Postscript is added out of a charitable respect to others; it is only to offer a helping hand to our Brethren: And if any are minded to make a matter of dispute about what we have said, we let them know that it is no concern of ours, nor are we obliged farther to manage it. As to what concerns our selves, we hope we have set the Terms of Conformity in such a light, as to satisfy indifferent Persons: if we have not satisfi'd those who are under the Power of invincible Prejudices, we only say, that we wish we could have done it. But we hope at least that they will forbear their liberal Censures of us, when they have seen what defence we have made. If any think to put back the Charge of *Misrepresentation* upon us, we must needs say, we are not afraid of it. If Mr. Calamy will either attempt

tempt to invalidate our Rule of interpretation, or shew wherein we have misapply'd it in the several matters that we try thereby, we will give what he returns all due consideration. But if any Person should pretend to reply with Quirks and Jest on one hand, or Bitterness and Railing on the other; or should carp at some few passages, while the strength of our Answer is neglected and past over, we shall not think our time ought to be so idly spent, as to make any Rejoinder. *Let us follow the things that make for Peace, and the things whereby we may edifie one another.*

F I N I S.

BOOKS Printed for Richard Wilkin at the King's-Head in St. Paul's Church-Yard.

A Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy, in Answer to a Book of Mr. David Clarkson, Entitled Primitive Episcopacy. By Henry Maurice, D.D. The 2d Edition. 8°.

Directions to Communicants; Shewing how to prepare for the Holy Communion; how to receive it, and how to lead an Holy Christian Life after it every Day; Being a Brief Summary of Christian Faith and Practice. Price 2d, or 2s 6d per Dozen. Some

Books Printed for Richard Wilkin.

Some plain Letters in the Defence of Infant-Baptism, and of the mode of Baptizing, (now generally used in the Church of *England*) by Sprinkling or Pouring on of Water; which may serve for a Confutation of a small Treatise, Entituled, *The Reason why not Infant Sprinkling, but Believers Baptism ought to be approved, &c.* 8°.

A Just Vindication of some Plain Letters in the Defence of Infant-Baptism, and of the Mode of Baptizing (now generally used in the Church of *England*) by Sprinkling, or Pouring on of Water. Being a Reply to Dr. *Russell's* Just Vindication (as He calls it) of the Doctrine and Practice of St. *John* the Baptist, &c. wherein He pretends to have Examined and Confuted the said Plain Letters, 8°.

The Countrey Curate to the Countrey People, Endeavouring a plain Account of the Cross in Baptism, kneeling at the Holy Communion; the Wedding Ring, and the Surplice, with a Brief Introduction, shewing the true State of the Toleration, fitted for the meanest Capacities, 8°. Price 6d.

A Serious Address to the Anabaptists: Being a Letter from a Minister to His Parishioner of that Persuasion. 8°. Price 1d.

A second Address to the Anabaptists: Being a Vindication of the former, from the Exceptions made to it in a Late Paper, Entituled A Brief Reply, &c. By *Richard George* and *Thomas Ranger*. By the Author of the serious Address, 8°. Price 2d.

A short Defence of Infants Baptism, in the Correction of some of the Errours contained in a Late Pamphlet Entituled the Rector Corrected, &c. By *Edward Paye*. By a Lover of Truth and Peace. 8°. Price 2d.

5 JY 61